

JPRS-UIA-87-026

27 MAY 1987

# USSR Report

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

19980610 029

SPECIAL NOTICE INSIDE

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

# SPECIAL NOTICE

Effective 1 June 1987 JPRS reports will have a new cover design and color, and some reports will have a different title and format. Some of the color changes may be implemented earlier if existing supplies of stock are depleted.

The new cover colors will be as follows:

CHINA.....aqua  
EAST EUROPE.....gold  
SOVIET UNION.....salmon  
EAST ASIA.....yellow  
NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA...blue  
LATIN AMERICA.....pink  
WEST EUROPE.....ivory  
AFRICA (SUB-SAHARA).....tan  
SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY.....gray  
WORLDWIDES.....pewter

The changes that are of interest to readers of this report are as follows:

USSR reports will become SOVIET UNION reports.

The USSR REPORT: NATIONAL ECONOMY will be titled SOVIET UNION/ECONOMIC AFFAIRS (UEA).

The USSR REPORT: POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS will be titled SOVIET UNION/POLITICAL AFFAIRS (UPA).

The following Soviet journals will be added to those which are already issued in separate series:

EKO: ECONOMICS & ORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION (UEO)  
THE WORKING CLASS & THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD (UWC)  
PEOPLES OF ASIA & AFRICA (UAA)  
MILITARY HISTORY JOURNAL (UMJ)  
FOREIGN MILITARY REVIEW (UFM)  
AVIATION & COSMONAUTICS (UAC)  
SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES (USS)

If any subscription changes are desired, U.S. Government subscribers should notify their distribution contact point. Nongovernment subscribers should contact the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161.

## NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

## PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

27 MAY 1987

USSR REPORT  
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

## CONTENTS

## WORLDWIDE TOPICS

Issue of States' Control Over Ocean Resources Discussed (V. D. Pisarev; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	1
Ambassador Igor Yuryevich Andropov Interviewed (Maya Sidorova, Vladimir Molchanov; Moscow Television Service, 18 Apr 87) .....	10

## GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Soviet Foreign Trade Data for 1986 (FOREIGN TRADE, No 3, 1987) .....	13
Problems With Rank Xerox Joint Venture (Natalya Izyumova, Alexander Guber; MOSCOW NEWS, No 16, 19 Apr 87) .....	18

## UNITED STATES AND CANADA

U.S.-Soviet Schoolchildren Queried on War, Peace (Nikolai Popov; MOSCOW NEWS, No 16, 19 Apr 87) .....	20
Ponomarev Expounds on U.S. Neoglobalism (P. Ponomarev; PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN', No 5, Mar 87) .....	22
Literary Journal on U.S., CIA Use of Religious Movements (N. Yakovlev; OKTYABR, Nos 2, 3, 1987) .....	29
U.S. Campaign Against Drugs Called 'Sisyphean' (A. Burmistenko; TRUD, 7 Feb 87) .....	30

## WESTERN EUROPE

Thatcher TV Interview Assessed From Glasnost Standpoint (Vladimir Simonov; MOSCOW NEWS, No 15, 19-26 Apr 87) .....	33
---	----

## EASTERN EUROPE

RSFSR Foreign Minister on Serbia, Montenegro Visit, Ties (V. M. Vinogradov Interview; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, .....	35
Czechs Process Foods Directly at Agricultural Cooperatives (SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 6 Mar 87) .....	37
Bulgarian-Soviet Corn Selection Project Delays (SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 17 Apr 87) .....	38

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Latin America Institute Director Volskiy on Debt Crisis (Viktor Vatslavovich Volskiy Interview; IZVESTIYA, 26 Feb 87) .....	39
Table of Contents: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 2, 1987 (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	43
Review of Journal LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 2, 1987 (APN DAILY REVIEW, 27 Feb 87) .....	45
Editorial on 'New Political Thinking' in Latin America (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	48
Argentine President Alfonsin Interviewed (Raul Alfonsin; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	50
Uruguayan Trade Union Officials on Union's Role, Tasks (Daniel Martinez Interview; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	56
Creation of 200-Mile Zone in Latin America, Caribbean Viewed (V. B. Tarasov; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	62
Latin American Continental Shelf Resource Development Noted (K. S. Tarasov, A. Yu. Teslenko; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	69
Demographic Encyclopedia Dictionary Published (A. P. Alekseyev; LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	78
Soviet-Bolivian Seminar on Bolivia's Social Development Held (LATINSKAYA AMERIKA, No 2, Feb 87) .....	80

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

PRC Weekly Cited on Foreign Trade Successes, 'Consumerism' (PRAVDA, 31 Mar 87) .....	84
---	----

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

Renewed PLO Unity Praised, Egypt, U.S. Negative Reactions Hit (IZVESTIYA, 29 Apr 87) .....	85
Lebanese Internal Conflict Discussed, Syrian Role Praised (L. Volnov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 10 Apr 87) .....	87
Ba'th Party History, Syrian Role in Lebanon Analyzed (P. Demchenko; PRAVDA, 6 Apr 87) .....	89
PRAVDA Views Current Sudanese Political Scene (V. Belyakov; PRAVDA, 15 Apr 87) .....	92
Former USSR Ambassador Recalls Tripoli Bombing (Oleg Peresypkin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 14 Apr 87) .....	94

/9987

## WORLDWIDE TOPICS

### ISSUE OF STATES' CONTROL OVER OCEAN RESOURCES DISCUSSED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 48-60

[Article by V.D. Pisarev: "On the Utilization of Marine Expanses and Resources" under the rubric of "Global Problems of the Present Day: Development of the World Ocean"]

[Excerpts] With the scientific and technical revolution there has been significant growth in the scale on which marine expanses and resources are used, while the bilateral and unilateral relations in this area have become more complex and reached such a level of development that real grounds have emerged for the interpretation of the range of tasks which the international community has encountered in connection with the development of the World Ocean as one of the global problems of the present day. The central elements in this multifaceted problem are the military-political, economic and international-law questions; the search for the resolution of these questions began as early as the first postwar decades.

In the military-political area such basic agreements as the 1963 Treaty Banning the Testing of Nuclear Weapons in the Atmosphere, Outer Space and Under Water and the 1971 Treaty Banning the Siting of Nuclear Weapons and Other Forms of Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Floor of or in the Seas and Oceans have marked important stages in the development of international relations in the oceanic sphere. An important direction in the military-political regulation is the creation of nuclear-weapons free zones and zones of peace and security in the World Ocean; this kind of regulation began with the signing of the Treaty on Antarctica (1959), which provided, in particular, for the complete demilitarization of the colossal ocean expanses around the sixth continent, and the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (the "Tlatelolco Treaty," 1967), which includes the adjacent ocean regions in its operational sphere. The Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapons Free Zone in the Southern Part of the Pacific Ocean, which was adopted by the South Pacific Forum (1985), has made a large contribution to the development of a reliable system of security in the Asia-Pacific region.

While developing a fundamental policy aimed at halting the arms race, eliminating nuclear weapons and creating an all-encompassing system of international security, the Soviet Union has put forward a whole series of initiatives aimed at lowering the level of military confrontation in the ocean

expanses, at limiting and directly reducing naval weapons, and at creating zones of peace, security and cooperation in the World Ocean. Proposals by other peace-loving states to further develop the process of demilitarizing the ocean expanses also receive active support in our country. In a joint Soviet-Argentine statement published at the end of the visit by Argentine President R. Alfonsin to the USSR, it was emphasized that the Soviet Union "reacted positively to Brazil's initiative, which was supported by Argentina and other countries in the region, on declaring the South Atlantic to be a zone of peace and cooperation." [1]

The USA, which is attempting to increase its military presence in the subregion, takes a directly opposite position on this very important question. At the 41st session of the UN General Assembly the USA voted against a resolution declaring the South Atlantic to be a zone of peace and cooperation, which was adopted by the overwhelming majority of states. This action by Washington is a logical extension of the Reagan administration policy of creating foci of military tension in the ocean expanses. This policy is a challenge not only to the coastal states which fall within the "sphere of action" of American "gunboat diplomacy" (provocations by the U.S. Navy along the shores of the Central American states and in the Near East) but also to all mankind, which favors turning the ocean expanses into a zone of peace and cooperation.

Progress in the process of regulating military-political problems of international relations in the oceanic sphere is a guarantee of further expansion in the scale and an increase in the effectiveness of the peaceful utilization of marine expanses and resources; the latter's contribution to the development of the world economy is growing steadily. Today the maritime fleet accounts for about 80 percent of international trade. Underwater deposits account for more than one-quarter of the total of all the petroleum produced in the world. The development of fish resources provides one of the most important sources of protein consumed by man. [2]

However, the development of the oceanic potential is taking place in an extremely uneven manner. It is enough to say that a total of only 10 of the leading capitalist countries control about 30 percent of the world's total fish catch. In the area of underwater oil production, five Western powers account for the same proportion of petroleum. The industrially developed capitalist states also account for the bulk of international ocean cargo shipments. For this reason the efforts of the world community to create conditions which promote the expansion of opportunities for the developing countries to utilize the oceanic potential are becoming one of the main areas of emphasis, and it is within the framework of this thrust that the process of regulating this global problem is taking place and will continue to take place.

The significance of the World Ocean in the system of relations regulated by international law results from the fact that most of this natural complex lies beyond any national jurisdiction and is at the general disposal of all mankind: socialist and capitalist states, industrial and developing states, coastal states and those which do not have access to the sea. Because the goals and opportunities for such utilization by the member countries of the



world community are substantially different, the key international problem in this area is coordinating their economic and political interests with regard to the development of oceanic activities.

The development of a universal political-legal system for the World Ocean has become the central element in the regulation of international relations with regard to the development of marine expanses and resources. The developing countries have played an ever increasing role in the development of this process since the mid-60's; they have linked to the creation of an all-encompassing "charter of the seas" their hopes for the expansion of their control over the natural resources of the marine regions adjacent to their shores, for the utilization of the raw material potential of the World Ocean in the interests of accelerating national development, and for the reorganization of international economic relations on the basis of the principles of equal rights and justice. The politics and positions of these states were one of the deciding factors in the UN adoption of the new Convention on the Law of the Sea in 1982. [3]

The establishment of the 200-mile exclusive economic zones (EEZ) set out in the Convention has been one of the most important directions in the regulation of oceanic activity. The total area of the World Ocean covered by these zones is equivalent in size to the dry-land surface of the globe. The Convention invests the coastal states with sovereign rights to the natural resources of the EEZ's and jurisdiction over marine scientific research, protection of the marine environment, as well as over the creation and utilization of artificial islands and facilities within the limits of this zone.

The developing countries, which account for more than half of the total area of the increased resource jurisdiction, view the establishment of this institution (i.e., the EEZ) as an important factor which strengthens their positions with regard to the imperialist powers and the MNC's (multinational corporations), as well as one of the most important preconditions for developing their national ocean-related industries, and especially for increasing the scale on which the oil and gas potential of the continental shelf is developed and the fishing industry is expanded.

Today the development of underwater oil deposits is taking place in more than 30 developing countries; they account for approximately 65 percent of the total underwater production. [4] In the area of the ocean fishing, the developing countries account for 48 percent of the total world fish catch. [5] It is important, however, to take account of the fact that the development of industrial projects on the shelf, new opportunities in the area of fishing and the implementation of non-resource industrial projects in the coastal sea regions definitely require modern technology, major capital investment, skilled personnel and information; access to all of which is key problem for a majority of the developing states. [6] This circumstance is the primary one in the calculations of the capitalist countries, headed by the USA, with regard to the establishment of the EEZ's and the related restructuring of relations with the developing countries.

The Western industrial powers proceed from the premise that the expansion of the sphere of resource jurisdiction by the developing countries presents the

latter with a complex set of tasks related to assessing the EEZ potential, implementing marine boundaries, as well as clarifying, distributing and coordinating the rights, obligations and responsibilities between neighboring coastal states and in their relations with "outsiders" (intra-continental countries and states which work in foreign EEZ's). No less complex are the problems of drawing up national marine legislation, planning, organizing and monitoring work in the EEZ's.

In contrast with the USA, which for 20 years has carried out a comprehensive program for the utilization of a marine coastal zone (three miles in width) and which by the time the EEZ was established had accumulated colossal management experience in this area, the developing countries were faced with an immeasurably more complex set of problems concerning the development of an area 200 miles in width and the management of activities not only by their own companies and organizations but also by "outsiders." The paucity of information on the economic potential of the EEZ's, the lack of infrastructures or the lack of capital to develop them, as well as the related economic and scientific-technical dependence of many "third world" states on outside help were factors which began to be considered in the USA from the viewpoint of opening up new channels to influence the economic policy of these countries and to obtain preferential rights of access to the raw material potential of their marine coastal regions. The policy of the MNC's, which possess advanced marine technology, the interest of the developing countries in obtaining aid, the conflicts of neighboring states on questions of catching migrating species of fish and deposits of oil and gas located in border areas, as well as economically important information controlled by the monopolies with regard to the potential of the respective marine regions are viewed in the West as factors which will facilitate the imposition upon the accepting countries of one-sided conditions of "cooperation" in the development of the EEZ's.

Thus the capitalist powers consider that the actual control of the developing countries over the resource potential of their vast coastal regions will fall short of legal control, while the universal establishment of EEZ's opens up new opportunities for the realization of a neocolonialist policy in an area of inter-state relations as important as oceanic activities have become.

One of the central features in the expansionist marine policy of the imperialist powers is their active participation in the development of underwater oil and gas deposits on the shelves of the developing countries, where the Western monopolies perform much of the exploration and development work; operating on the basis of licenses and within the framework of joint enterprises, they obtain access to new sources of oil and gas. In addition, with the growing contribution of underwater deposits to world oil production, information about the marine resource potential of the receiving states which the MNC's obtain in the course of their work on the shelves of the developing states (in combination with the long-standing purposeful policy of the USA concerning strict regulation of the rate of underwater fuel production along its coasts) is utilized by the monopolies to expand their influence on world markets for this strategic raw material and thus on the policy of the developing states which are oil exporters. The recruitment of American

corporations for the development of these deposits serves U.S. diplomacy as an argument in the discussions about its "dependence" on foreign sources of a strategic raw material and the "vital importance" of the corresponding regions of the World Ocean. This, in turn, is used as "grounds" for military-political actions designed to ensure American interests in the colossal marine regions adjacent to the coastal area of the developing states.

Under these conditions the desire of the liberated countries to expand their opportunities to carry out independent work in their own EEZ's and their policy of becoming independent of "assistance" from the MNC's are justified not only from an economic but also from a political viewpoint. The developing countries take a similar position in their approach to questions of the development of "cooperation" with the Western monopolies in the area of fishing. For a majority of states the specific feature of this industry lies in the fact that it encompasses the traditional sphere of oceanic activity; small-scale fishing has a large role to play here, and its functioning ensures by itself not only a valuable protein product and employment for the population in coastal regions, but also currency earnings for the national economy. For a number of island states fishing is one of the dominant economic sectors.

In accordance with the Convention, the countries of Latin America, Asia, Africa and Oceania received sovereign rights to the live marine resources in the regions where they are most highly concentrated inasmuch as the 200 mile-belt accounts for more than 80 percent of all the fish stocks of the developable resources of the World Ocean. The spatial dimensions of the developing states' EEZ's are also great. Suffice it to say that the total area of the EEZ's of just 23 island states which comprise the South Pacific Forum, total about 30 million square kilometers and exceeds their dry-land area more than 50-fold. [7]

It is also essential to consider that the process of expanding and strengthening the resource sovereignty of the developing countries runs parallel to the policy of the coastal states aimed at creating peace zones and nuclear-free zones in the World Ocean. A striking example of this is to be found in the continuing struggle of the peace-loving community to have the Indian Ocean declared a peace zone and to have the states of the South Pacific decide to create a nuclear-free zone in the subregion. This means that there are fewer economic and legal grounds as well as fewer political grounds for the presence of the fleets of the imperialist powers in the regions of the World Ocean, thousands of miles away from their base ports.

The desire of the USA and other leading Western states to undermine this tendency and to preserve, diversify and strengthen the channels of access to the strategically important regions of the World Ocean which are covered by the EEZ's of the developing countries, lies at the basis of their conflicts with this group of states; these conflicts have continued to exist even after the conclusion of the 3d UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. It is from these positions that one should evaluate Great Britain's desire to assert its claims to the Malvinas Islands and its decision to declare a 150-mile "zone of exclusive fishing rights" around this archipelago beginning 1 February 1987.

Along with the institution of the EEZ, one of the most important aspects of the regulation of World Ocean activity established by the Convention is the set of conditions for the development of the ocean floor located outside national jurisdiction, in an area which is 1.5-fold greater than the total surface of all the earth's continents. It is here in the deep-sea portions of the ocean floor that most of the deposits of poly-metal nodules (PMN)

are located; they contain about 20 of the most important types of metals, of which nickel, cobalt, copper and manganese are of the most interest today. In the Pacific Ocean alone the total area of the regions which have nodule

deposits which can be profitably developed amounts to approximately 3 million square kilometers. The potential reserves of the PMN's in these regions are judged to be 21 billion tons and contain (in comparison with world-wide, dry-land reserves of the respective metals) the same quantity of manganese, five times the amount of nickel and 40 times the amount of cobalt.

In the 60's the North American monopolies unleashed a struggle for control of colossal sections of the deepsea bed and the strategic raw materials located there. The USA thinks that utilization of the seabed will expand the mineral-raw material base of the U.S. economy, will increase opportunities to dictate its will in relations with exporters which have land deposits of the respective metals and will become an important source of profits for the monopolies. It was from these positions that the USA approached the question of the legal regulation of work performed in the international region of the World Ocean floor, insisting that the Convention establish principles and norms which will ensure for the North American multinational corporations unhindered access to the deepsea resources and international guarantees of capital investment in this activity. Both before and during the conference the USA directed its efforts toward the creation of this set of conditions.

In the American drafts the developing countries figured primarily as parties receiving "royalties" from the profits extracted by the monopolies in the course of exploiting international resources. [12] These royalties, which in essence give these countries the status of renter, are presented by Western political scientists as a kind of "compensation" for the damage inflicted in the past by the capitalist states on the poorly developed countries and a way to reduce the gap in economic development levels. [13] In fact, however, the essence of the U.S. drafts amounted to the creation of an international political-legal system which, on the one hand, would "legitimize" the expansionism of the monopolies and, on the other, was an effective instrument of the neocolonialist policy of the imperialist powers, which perpetuates the economic backwardness of those states which have acquired political independence.

The opposition of the developing countries to this kind of U.S. policy found complete support from the socialist states. They, too, found unacceptable a course aimed 1) at using the capitalist-enterprise system as the basis for organizing international relations in the area of utilizing the ocean floor, which had been declared by the UN to be the common heritage of mankind, 2) at creating a set of conditions for the distribution of the rights to sections

of the ocean floor on the basis of the economic power of the claimants and 3) at ensuring the monopolization by a narrow group of imperialist powers of the resource potential which is in the general domain of all mankind. From the very beginning the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries held to the line that the international system being established for the utilization of the ocean floor expanses and resources which fall outside state jurisdiction must take into consideration the differences and features of the two opposing social systems and that conditions must be created for the developing countries to participate on the basis of equal rights in the development of deepsea resources and the management of activities in the international region. Over a period of many years the liberated countries have struggled side by side with the liberated countries to create conditions which would meet the interests of all mankind and contribute to the re-organization of international economic relations on a just and democratic foundation based on the fundamental principles of the UN Charter.

The adoption of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea was the result of this struggle. It is based on consideration for the economic and political realities, and while it reflects the interests of states with opposing socio-economic systems, it has become a constructive basis for the development of international cooperation based on equal rights in the regulated utilization of the World Ocean resources. One of the foundations of the Convention is the inalienable and equal right to the utilization of the ocean floor resources for all states, regardless of their socio-political system, level of economic development or geographical position. The Convention emphasizes that it is unacceptable to appropriate sections of the seabed in the international region; it declares that it is necessary to prevent the utilization of these sections from being monopolized, and it stipulates measures for international control over the activities of the MNC's in this area.

After intensive but fruitless attempts to impose upon the world community the American demands for the radical re-organization of the seabed conditions, the Reagan administration refused to sign the Convention, saying it was a document which contains "unnecessary economic and political limitations," denies the "fundamental principles" of private property, free enterprise and competition, and creates an undesirable precedent for future talks with regard to the new international economic order (NIEO). [14] These statements are the basis for the American arguments designed to justify the agreements signed outside the Convention within the framework of a narrow group of imperialist states.

The socialist and developing countries have stated that they do not recognize the illegal claims of the "outsider" states. They describe the separate approach of the USA and its partners with regard to the "mini-treaties" as a policy of seizing and dividing the most promising segments of the ocean floor, a policy which avoids and violates the Convention and creates chaos on the issues of utilizing World Ocean resources. The illegal course of the USA testifies to the desire of the Reagan administration to utilize the conflict with the Convention participants to demonstrate American policy from a position of strength not only within the framework of bilateral and regional relations but also within the system of global relations with regard to those problems which touch upon the interests of all humanity.

Washington's obstructionist approach to the development of international relations in the oceanic sphere has also found reflection in its policy of undermining the treaty bases for the regulation of international shipping. Specifically, the USA refused to sign the UN Convention on the Code of Conduct for Transport Line Conferences; the developing countries had put forward an initiative for the development of such a code in an effort to ensure themselves a fair share of foreign trade cargo in maritime shipping. The USA also follows a conflicting policy in UNESCO's Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), the basic organization of the UN system which coordinates a program of international research into the World Ocean. Although it withdrew from UNESCO, the USA remains in the IOC; however, it not only delays fulfillment of its financial obligations to this organization but also tries to influence in a one-sided manner the area in which American dues are used within the framework of the total budget. This kind of U.S. policy negatively influences the agreed-upon plans and activities of the IOC. It also hinders the realization of IOC programs to help the developing states in the area of marine science and technology and to train the oceanographic personnel necessary to strengthen an independent national marine policy in these countries.

Thus, analysis shows that the main obstacle to the successful resolution of the problem of developing the World Ocean is the policy of the imperialist powers, headed by the USA, which is trying to extract unilateral military, economic and political advantages in the process of developing oceanic expanses and resources. Opposition to this neoglobalist policy today unites all states which favor the just regulation of the problems which are vitally important for all mankind.

For the developing countries the task of developing the World Ocean is one of the most urgent because it is related not only to their hopes for effective utilization of the oceanic potential in the interests of economic development but also to the prospects for resolving fundamental problems such as the establishment of an NIEO guaranteeing equal economic security for all states; the elimination of the economic backwardness of many liberated countries; the satisfaction of the food, raw-material and energy requirements of the growing population of the Earth; the development of maritime trade and shipping and the maintenance of ecological balance on our planet.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. PRAVDA. 18 October 1986.
2. In the early 80's the proportion of animal protein derived from fish amounted to about 25 percent of the protein in mankind's diet.
3. "Morskoye pravo. Ofitsialnyy tekst Konventsii OON po morskomu pravu s prilozheniyami i predmetnym ukazatelem" [Law of the Sea. Official Text of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea with Appendices and Subject Index]. UN, New York, 1984.

4. OFFSHORE. London, Vol 45, No 5, 1985, p 114.
5. FAO. "1982. Yearbook of Fishery Statistics. Catches and Landings." Rome, Vol 54, 1984, pp 79, 92-96.
6. C. Gopalakrishnan. "Multinational Corporations and Marine Technology Transfer: an Overview and Assessment." Pacific Congress on Marine Technology 1986. Honolulu, 1986, Proceedings, p. MAM5/4.
7. "The Law of the Sea and Ocean Development Issues in the Pacific Basin." Honolulu, 1983, p 159.
12. United States Policy for the Seabed. Statement by President Nixon, 1970. E. Went. "The Politics of the Ocean." Seattle--London, 1972, pp 485-486.
13. The demagogic nature of the multi-billion dollar American bribes emerged as early as the late 70's, when it became clear that the real international income would be incomparably less than expected, while the prospects for receiving that income (by the developing countries) are being postponed for many decades.
14. Statement by the President on the Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States. "The Exclusive Economic Zone of the United States: Some Immediate Policy Issues." NACOA. Washington, 1984, pp 103-104; T.L. Malone. "Who Needs the Sea Treaty?" FOREIGN POLICY. Washington, No 54, 1984, pp 44-63; L.S. Ratiner. "The Law of the Sea: a Crossroads for American Foreign Policy" FOREIGN AFFAIRS. New York, Vol 60, No 5, 1982, pp 10006-10021.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

8543

CSO: 1807/207

WORLDWIDE TOPICS

AMBASSADOR IGOR YURIEVICH ANDROPOV INTERVIEWED

LD191129 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1940 GMT 18 Apr 87

[From the "Around Midnight" program, presented by Maya Sidorova and Vladimir Molchanov; Molchanov "Studio-20" interview with "Ambassador-at-Large" Igor Yuriyevich Andropov--live or recorded]

[Text] [Molchanov] We invite people of various professions and ages onto our program. Today we have as a guest, a diplomat, Ambassador-at-Large Igor Yuriyevich Andropov [son of the former party leader Yuriy Andropov]. If I am not mistaken, you are one of our country's youngest ambassadors. How old are you?

[Andropov] I am 45. But let me point out that there are some very well qualified and professional young men in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who are younger than I and who will soon be ambassadors.

[Molchanov] There are those who have a distorted idea of the diplomat's life. They think about it mainly as living abroad, going from one reception to another. Our program is watched by many young people who may well be dreaming of what they see as a very attractive life of high living. What would you like to say to them?

[Andropov] Nothing is further from such an impression of the work of a diplomat. Let me say first that at this moment, around midnight, as you and I sit here, many of my colleagues will be at their desks at Smolenskaya Sennaya Square [address of USSR Foreign Ministry]. They will be there up to and beyond midnight, and quite a long time beyond midnight. Lights will be burning in their windows and it will be some time before their work is done. I want to make this point straight away to show that a diplomat's work is in no way easy. The second point is that the stereotype--a stereotype which has been created regrettably not without help from our literature, but in my view not very accurately, as well as by our cinema--is a stereotype consisting of three or four elements: I don't know exactly, but I suppose a Mercedes, a reclining armchair, a beautiful view on to the sea, and all the rest of it. This, unfortunately, is a grand delusion which can only give our young people an image which is the reverse of the truth. Diplomacy is a complicated business, and its forms are becoming ever more complicated. A picture of modern diplomacy in



no way resembles a picture of diplomacy in the 19th century, for instance. I think that Bismarck and Gorchakov, were they to find themselves in a present-day situation, would, with all their brilliant abilities, probably not be able to find their feet at once, so varied are the horizons of modern diplomacy.

The face of our diplomacy is now changing before us, because the restructuring taking place in the country impinges directly on the Foreign Ministry and on our foreign policy activities--what we quite rightly call the new foreign policy thinking.

[Molchanov] Igor Yuriyevich, various professions require of people various degrees of risk, of courage. What does displaying courage mean for a diplomat?

[Andropov] That is a very good question. For me there does exist, or there should exist, such a category as the courage of a diplomat. It is related to the category of the courage of a citizen, but is broader. It is the professional courage of a person whose duty is to relay back to the center an absolutely real picture of what is happening locally, in the country where he is serving, or at the talks he is attending--a picture absolutely free of subjectivism, of the merest hint of client-patron relationship [kliyenturshchina].

[Molchanov] But is it always like that?

[Andropov] No, not always. I have been in the diplomatic service for a comparatively short time, about 10 years, but I have colleagues with rather broader experience, maybe 30 years, or even more in some cases. I can say with confidence that the majority of them, when in critical situations, have conducted themselves courageously.

[Molchanov] Igor Yuriyevich, my last question. Much is now being talked of in connection with openness [glasnost] in foreign policy. What is your view about this?

[Andropov] I regard this as a very important matter. But in principle it is no issue for us because the issue of open diplomacy was resolved by us 70 years ago, and everyone is well aware of this. As I see it, the basis of this question is the following: Is diplomacy possible without an element of confidentiality? Can it be diplomacy otherwise? In the West the question always arises: What proportion should the public know, and what should it not know? For us there is no question here: The public should know everything. There is merely the question of techniques, as in any matter. I consider that we have all the possible conditions, material included, by which I mean we are prepared for this. We have a wonderful army of journalists which could, or rather ought, with a sense of responsibility, to raise questions bearing on foreign policy. I would not like to name names. There are many names, fully enough of them, so this problem of openness can, from all points of view, be resolved for us, but by other ways than has been done in bourgeois models.

[Molchanov] Thank you for this interview and for coming to the studio. All the best to you.

[Andropov] Thank you, thank you very much.

/12858

CSO: 1807/282

SOVIET FOREIGN TRADE DATA FOR 1986

Moscow FOREIGN TRADE in English No 3, 1987 pp 57-60

[Text]

# Soviet Foreign Trade

## *January—December 1986*

(Statistical Data)

### Soviet Foreign Trade by Groups of Countries

(mln rubles)

		January—December				January—December	
		1985	1986			1985	1986
TOTAL	Turnover	142092,9	130931,2	Industrial capitalist countries	Turnover	37875,7	28989,2
	Export	72663,7	68343,1		Export	18581,4	13136,0
	Import	69429,2	62588,1		Import	19294,3	15853,2
Socialist countries	Turnover	86959,2	87497,5				
	Export	44467,3	45656,9				
	Import	42491,9	41840,6				
including:							
CMEA member countries	Turnover	78108,0	79985,7	Developing countries	Turnover	17258,0	14144,5
	Export	40223,8	42188,7		Export	9615,0	9550,2
	Import	37884,2	37797,0		Import	7643,0	4894,3

# Soviet Foreign Trade by Countries\*

(mln rubles)

Countries		January—December		Countries		January—December	
		1985	1986			1985	1986
<b>EUROPE:</b>				Hungary	Turnover	9468,6	9551,6
Austria	Turnover	1669,2	1392,5		Export	4576,7	4678,2
	Export	804,6	540,3		Import	4891,9	4873,4
	Import	864,6	852,2				
Belgium	Turnover	1440,0	1049,2	German Democratic Republic	Turnover	15261,6	15008,5
	Export	858,2	627,1		Export	7669,9	7880,4
	Import	581,8	422,1		Import	7591,7	7128,1
Bulgaria	Turnover	12511,5	12979,1	Greece	Turnover	728,4	284,0
	Export	6455,5	6787,8		Export	594,1	219,4
	Import	6056,0	6191,3		Import	134,3	64,6
Great Britain	Turnover	1903,0	1788,6	Denmark	Turnover	395,3	266,6
	Export	1217,9	1274,0		Export	270,8	135,9
	Import	685,1	514,6		Import	124,5	130,7
				West Berlin	Turnover	410,6	268,9
					Export	259,3	159,1
					Import	151,3	109,8

\* The countries are given in the Russian alphabetical order.

Supplement to the *Foreign Trade* journal. Editorial office address: 11, Minskaya Street, Moscow, 121108, USSR. Telephone: 145-63-94

Countries		January—December		Countries		January—December	
		1985	1986			1985	1986
Ireland	Turnover	56,5	54,0	France	Turnover	3778,7	2670,5
	Export	25,5	17,7		Export	2174,7	1540,9
	Import	31,0	36,3		Import	1604,0	1129,6
Iceland	Turnover	109,5	65,1	Czechoslovakia	Turnover	13462,2	13503,4
	Export	60,1	30,4		Export	6829,9	6947,0
	Import	49,4	34,7		Import	6632,3	6556,4
Spain	Turnover	588,5	296,9	Switzerland	Turnover	950,9	742,6
	Export	235,0	124,1		Export	383,8	287,1
	Import	353,5	172,8		Import	567,1	455,5
Italy	Turnover	3796,7	3054,3	Sweden	Turnover	798,7	543,1
	Export	2468,3	1580,5		Export	492,1	297,9
	Import	1328,4	1473,8		Import	306,6	245,2
Liechtenstein	Turnover	7,9	22,1	Yugoslavia	Turnover	6089,2	4414,6
	Export	0,8	1,1		Export	2722,7	1738,5
	Import	7,1	21,0		Import	3366,5	2676,1
Luxembourg	Turnover	19,3	18,1	ASIA:			
	Export	8,1	9,1	Afghanistan	Turnover	873,6	789,7
	Import	11,2	9,0		Export	550,6	542,1
Malta	Turnover	27,2	25,2		Import	323,0	244,6
	Export	6,5	6,6	Bangladesh	Turnover	76,4	67,7
	Import	20,7	18,6		Export	41,5	49,9
Netherlands	Turnover	1300,3	821,4		Import	31,9	17,8
	Export	986,6	576,1	Burma	Turnover	6,6	21,2
	Import	313,7	245,3		Export	0	1,2
Norway	Turnover	177,7	121,0		Import	6,6	20,0
	Export	104,4	52,1	Vietnam	Turnover	1458,9	1612,7
	Import	73,3	68,9		Export	1176,1	1318,4
Poland	Turnover	12131,6	12942,0		Import	282,8	294,3
	Export	6531,5	6813,8	India	Turnover	3084,4	2191,2
	Import	5600,1	6128,2		Export	1574,9	957,6
Portugal	Turnover	106,4	64,8		Import	1509,5	1233,6
	Export	48,9	25,8	Indonesia	Turnover	94,2	45,4
	Import	57,5	39,0		Export	3,7	3,1
Romania	Turnover	4259,1	5238,5		Import	90,5	42,3
	Export	1956,5	2823,3	Iraq	Turnover	824,2	638,6
	Import	2302,6	2415,2		Export	267,5	293,0
Federal Republic of Germany	Turnover	7094,6	5577,9		Import	556,7	345,6
	Export	3991,5	2720,1	Iran	Turnover	348,4	76,0
	Import	3103,1	2857,8		Export	204,2	57,8
Finland	Turnover	4989,7	3972,1		Import	144,2	18,2
	Export	2299,3	1594,6				
	Import	2690,4	2377,5				

Countries		January—December		Countries		January—December	
		1985	1986			1985	1986
Yemen Arab Republic	Turnover	15,2	10,1	Thailand	Turnover	67,9	90,9
	Export	15,1	10,0		Export	13,4	10,2
	Import	0,1	0,1		Import	54,5	80,7
People's Democratic Republic of Yemen	Turnover	153,7	107,2	Turkey	Turnover	316,1	220,5
	Export	145,3	102,0		Export	162,6	121,2
	Import	8,4	5,2		Import	153,5	99,3
Kampuchea	Turnover	100,3	122,7	Philippines	Turnover	39,7	17,4
	Export	91,2	114,0		Export	10,9	7,1
	Import	9,1	8,7		Import	28,8	10,0
Cyprus	Turnover	33,1	23,1	Sri Lanka	Turnover	38,1	25,1
	Export	21,4	11,6		Export	8,3	12,9
	Import	11,7	11,5		Import	29,8	12,2
China	Turnover	1614,9	1822,0	Japan	Turnover	3216,0	3185,3
	Export	780,4	910,3		Export	928,9	979,9
	Import	834,5	911,7		Import	2287,1	2205,4
Korean People's Democratic Republic	Turnover	1059,2	1207,9	AFRICA:			
	Export	651,8	757,2	Algeria	Turnover	405,2	327,8
	Import	404,4	450,7		Export	132,3	88,4
Laos	Turnover	87,9	67,3		Import	272,9	239,4
	Export	85,6	62,2	Angola	Turnover	96,5	158,2
	Import	2,3	5,1		Export	94,0	154,9
Lebanon	Turnover	12,4	9,2		Import	2,5	3,3
	Export	12,2	8,2	Ivory Coast	Turnover	130,2	128,9
	Import	0,2	1,0		Export	4,6	5,9
Malaysia	Turnover	191,2	104,2		Import	125,6	123,0
	Export	19,8	7,6	Ghana	Turnover	39,4	55,8
	Import	180,4	96,6		Export	1,0	1,0
Mongolian People's Republic	Turnover	1537,0	1547,4		Import	38,4	54,8
	Export	1150,3	1137,5	Guinea	Turnover	98,5	87,0
	Import	386,7	409,9		Export	40,5	35,9
Nepal	Turnover	20,9	1,3		Import	58,0	51,1
	Export	15,7	0,1	Egypt	Turnover	590,1	531,8
	Import	5,2	1,2		Export	282,5	263,6
Pakistan	Turnover	117,7	85,0		Import	307,6	268,2
	Export	58,6	37,1	Cameroun	Turnover	39,6	31,0
	Import	59,1	47,9		Export	8,2	7,1
Saudi Arabia	Turnover	393,9	193,7		Import	31,4	23,9
	Export	15,1	18,6	People's Republic of the Congo	Turnover	9,9	10,3
	Import	378,8	175,1		Export	5,8	4,9
Singapore	Turnover	90,3	62,6		Import	4,1	5,4
	Export	10,7	26,7	Libya	Turnover	961,2	730,6
	Import	79,6	35,9		Export	83,4	35,2
Syria	Turnover	514,0	472,5		Import	877,8	695,4
	Export	311,9	295,1				
	Import	192,4	177,4				

Countries		January—December		Countries		January—December	
		1985	1986			1985	1986
Morocco	Turnover	178,7	118,1	Cuba	Turnover	8017,5	7602,5
	Export	112,5	65,6		Export	3877,4	3502,3
	Import	66,2	52,5		Import	4140,1	3800,2
Mozambique	Turnover	85,6	59,6	Mexico	Turnover	20,3	11,9
	Export	84,1	57,9		Export	4,2	4,3
	Import	1,5	1,7		Import	16,1	7,6
Nigeria	Turnover			Nicaragua	Turnover	213,1	284,1
	Export	190,1	109,4		Export	212,9	276,4
	Import	149,1	99,9		Import	0,2	7,7
		41,0	9,5				
Tunisia	Turnover	23,0	38,9	Panama	Turnover	7,1	10,5
	Export	11,4	19,7		Export	7,1	10,5
	Import	11,6	19,2		Import	-	-
Ethiopia	Turnover	317,2	182,3	Peru	Turnover	119,8	84,4
	Export	282,6	153,1		Export	11,3	9,2
	Import	34,6	29,2		Import	108,5	75,2
AMERICAS:				United States of America	Turnover	2703,1	1458,5
Argentina	Turnover				Export	326,1	312,5
	Export	1292,9	245,7		Import	2377,0	1146,0
	Import	63,0	53,3	Uruguay	Turnover	65,9	24,9
		1229,9	192,4		Export	33,5	4,3
Brazil	Turnover				Import	32,4	20,0
	Export	450,3	266,8	AUSTRALIA AND OCEANIA:			
	Import	70,3	30,3				
		380,0	236,5	Australia	Turnover	545,8	517,3
Canada	Turnover	966,9	633,6		Export	13,7	8,2
	Export	17,8	9,8		Import	532,1	509,1
	Import	949,1	623,8	New Zealand	Turnover	90,3	93,7
Colombia	Turnover				Export	4,3	5,2
	Export	26,4	4,9		Import	86,0	88,5
	Import	5,2	4,9				
		21,2	0				

/8309

CSO: 1812/168

## GENERAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

### PROBLEMS WITH RANK XEROX JOINT VENTURE

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 16, 19 Apr 67 p 6

[Article by Natalya Izyumova and Alexander Guber]

[Text] IT IS BECOMING a standard practice for this newspaper to publish various opinions of heated issues. We will even publish opposing views, provided they are serious and plausible.

MN No. 11 carried an article by Yuri Dryomov, head of the Joint Ventures Department at the Ministry of Foreign Trade, which read, in particular, "...a firm which is well known to Soviet consumers for its copying equipment ... has been engaged for years in talks with the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Means of Automation and Control Systems. The purpose of the proposal is to organize in the Soviet Union only the assembly of this equipment, not allowing its complete production in this country. There can be no question of exporting these articles to the West because the firm is either reluctant or unable to make room on the world market for the sale of products assembled at a Soviet enterprise. Understanding that the advantage from that project was one-sided, the same firm suggested that it buy special copying paper from us, but for this we must launch its production on our own. The total value of investments for such a project runs about half a billion roubles. These talks are conducted in conditions when the principle of copying, used by the firm, is already obsolete..."

The firm in question is Britain's Rank Xerox Ltd., whose Moscow representative, Grant Sutherland, sent MN a letter to state his utter disagreement with what Yuri Dryomov said in his article. According to Grant Sutherland, his company's proposals are geared to lay the foundation for independent development of Xerographic techniques in the USSR. He writes that Rank Xerox use the principle of copying devised by Rank Xerox themselves. Until the alternative principles have become as reliable and affordable, the company is not going to give them up for the sake of some short-lived technical gadgets. Dazzling the world is not what Rank Xerox, the pioneer and consistent developer of xerography, believes in...

"Mr Dryomov's remark about 'special copying paper' is to be regarded as a slip of the tongue, because the copying machines use ordinary writing paper, which must be known even to Mr Dryomov.

"As to the rest, the company's latest proposal envisaged joint business on a compensation basis, which means that Rank Xerox is ready to buy Soviet manufactured goods on a scale necessary to compensate for the expenditures involved in importing units and parts to be assembled here.

"Since the Soviet side found it difficult to provide such goods in desired quantities, the company proposed to render the USSR free technical assistance in improving the quality of Soviet paper with a view to bringing its consumer qualities on a par with world market requirements. This would bring the USSR greater profits than those currently made on pulp, especially on the present pulp market...

"Our insistence on assembly as the basic stage for mastering the Xerox technology is accounted for by experience only. All the details and subtleties of the technological process can gradually become clear at least for specialists during assembly. We certainly excuse Mr Dryomov for failing to understand that.

"Rank Xerox is currently faced with a dilemma. In case the article in *Moscow News* is the official statement of our Soviet partner's position, we see no point in discussing further cooperation."

As we copied this letter with the Xerox machine we have in our office, we recalled that we have been using Xeroxes for years and have ordered more of the same for the future. Is it possible that the staff of "Prommashimport", the foreign trade agency in charge of importing copying machines to the Soviet Union, have been buying inferior and obsolete equipment, and propose to continue to do so in the future?

Well, Yuri Dryomov and Grant Sutherland have expressed diverging opinions. It is not for



the newspaper to decide. But having received the British businessman's letter, we could not remain silent. Therefore, telephoned Yuri Dryomov at the Ministry of Foreign Trade. He said, Rank Xerox misinterpreted his meaning because of the MN cuts in his article (the paragraph quoted above has not been cut at all - Ed.). He also said that he was right on principle and we should better not blow the thing up, to avoid trouble.

The latter recommendation reminded us of the recent past, when in answer to a pointed question by a reporter, a foreign trade official could say in a peremptory tone: "There's no point in discussing this subject". This implied commercial secrets or state interests and excluded the need for further explanations. A journalist was unable to overcome this wall. Any attempt to do so was fraught with personal complications.

The times have changed, and although commercial secrets remain, one should not try and pass one's mistake for a state secret. In case Yuri Dryomov disagrees, he has the right to say so openly not on the phone, but through the newspaper.

To some, the topic might seem unworthy of **Moscow News** attention. But we are planning to continue writing about international cooperation and address Soviet institutions and organizations working in that area. Naturally, we count on being understood and assisted by them rather than being put off with generalities, as has been happening to date.

We asked Grant Sutherland, who has just been nominated Chief of the Moscow mission, the British-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, to share his impressions of the perestroika in the USSR's foreign trade.

"I think it is going to be much more interesting to work here. Until now, we've been restricted to dealing with the Ministry of Foreign Trade, and sometimes it was very difficult to get to our end users. Now we have the opportunity to establish relations with many more organizations who have their own trade rights.

"I'll tell you about one of our problems. Rank Xerox has the right to negotiate with any Soviet organization provided the organization has its own buying section. But as far as import is concerned, we are still restricted to dealing with 'Prommashimport' of the Ministry of Foreign Trade, because of the special nature of our goods. Why are copying machines treated as strategic goods, while in the West they are on sale in department stores, and can be bought by anyone who can afford them? Perhaps, this is another thing that should come out of the perestroika: the attitude towards copying machines should change. They should be regarded as just another handy piece of machinery on a par with a type-writer."

**What are your first impressions of the way the perestroika ideas are being put to life?**

"Nothing happens overnight. But there are promising signs. As far as 'Soyuzzagranpribor' is concerned, we now deal with a recently appointed man called Yuri Agapov, whom we found a very capable man, who has good ideas."

It has become easier to organize meetings, where formerly, it used to take months to have a British businessman come here to meet with Soviet experts.

"I see things changing, and changing quite fast. Opinions are being expressed, people aren't afraid to come forward with what they've been thinking."

/13104

CSO: 1812/170

## UNITED STATES AND CANADA

### U.S.-SOVIET SCHOOLCHILDREN QUERIED ON WAR, PEACE

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 16, 19 Apr 87 p 6

[Article by Nikolai Popov, D.Sc. (History), senior research associate, Institute of the USA and Canada, USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text]

WE STROVE from the outset to make our project a really joint venture. Ever since the meeting of the project's two directors - Dr. Erik Chivian, of the Harvard Medical School, and myself - and all the way to the quizzing of the schoolchildren in the Tambov and Rostov regions and in the State of Maryland, everything was done jointly, on the basis of a single questionnaire and a single methodology. Professor Jonathan Tudge from the University of Utah took part in asking questions of the schoolchildren in Tambov and Rostov, and I came back recently from the USA where I had talked with schoolchildren who answered our quizz. Vladimir Andreyenkov from the Institute of Sociological Research, and John Robinson, Director of the Survey Research Center of the University of Maryland, organized the collection and primary processing of the data. Over 4,000 schoolchildren were polled in the USSR and over 3,000 - in the USA. Their ages ranged from 11 to 18.

We were interested in three groups of questions - what children know about nuclear weapons and nuclear war; how much they are troubled by the threat of nuclear war and whether they believe in the possibility of survival or victory in such a war; and how, in the context, do they see the present and the future of Soviet-US relations.

In both countries the parents subscribe to the idea that it is better to try and shelter the children from the fearsome facts about nuclear war, to let them grow up and, then, go in for discussing questions of life and death. However, 64 per cent of the Soviet and US schoolchildren, as it turned out, learn about nuclear weapons and the war threat from TV, radio, periodicals and books, and the rest - from parents and at

school. They are aware, in the main, of the damaging factors of nuclear weapons and do imagine their terrible destructive power and global nature. Two-thirds of them know about the "nuclear winter" concept.

Approximately 60 per cent of Soviet and 70 per cent of US schoolchildren do not believe it is possible to survive a nuclear war, and over a half think that no shelters with all the necessary supplies would help. And 70 per cent think that "there can be no winner in a world-wide nuclear war, since most countries would be totally destroyed".

But will there be a nuclear war? Here the opinions of schoolchildren of the two countries differ considerably. The majority of Soviet children - 56 per cent - think that there won't ever be war, and only 9 per cent think that it may happen in their lifetime. And 41 per cent of the US schoolchildren say that the war can break out during their lifetime and only 14 per cent - that war may never happen. Can greater optimism on the part of Soviet children be seen also in their answers to the other questions on the questionnaire?

Yes, we have several explanations for this. One of them, for example, can be obtained from the question included in the questionnaire: "Do you believe that no government is crazy enough to start a nuclear war?" Forty-one per cent of the Soviet children answered "yes, of course", and only 13 per cent of the Americans.

When assessing Soviet-US relations and their future, the two countries' schoolchildren were faced with the need to express their opinion on quite complex problems, which trigger off fierce arguments even among the adults. Who is stronger in nuclear weapons - the USSR or the USA? About a half of those polled answered that the forces are approximately equal and only

15 per cent on each side thought that one of the sides is stronger.

The knowledge of the various aspects of Soviet-US military-political relations proved to be rather uneven. Forty per cent of Soviet and 66 per cent of US schoolchildren didn't know whether the SALT-2 agreement had been ratified or not; 14 per cent of Soviet, and 95 per cent of US teenagers didn't know that the USSR had held a moratorium on nuclear tests. But 85 per cent of Soviet schoolchildren did know about this as compared with 4 per cent of US boys and girls.

The attitude to the SDI was different in the two countries as could have been expected. If 61 per cent of the Soviet children (of those who knew about the SDI) think that it would increase the war danger and only 9 – that it would lessen it, then in the USA the figures were – 40 per cent thought that it would lessen the war danger and 32 per cent – that it would increase it (the rest restrained from a precise answer).

In both countries the schoolchildren expressed considerable support for the idea of ending the development and testing of all types of nuclear weapons – 95 per cent in the USSR, and 66 per cent – in the USA. Approximately the same support was given to the proposals that "all nuclear weapons (and other mass-annihilation weapons) be liquidated by the end of our century".

The children of both countries realize that considerable problems block the way to improving Soviet-US relations. However, 65 per cent of the Soviet schoolchildren look at the future of Soviet-US relations optimistically, on the whole, 3 per cent – pessimistically, and 32 per cent didn't express their opinion. In the USA the figures were 40, 19 and 41 per cent respectively. We also wished to find out whether the children believe in the possibility of not only living without war, but also of developing cooperation and friendly relations. Eighty-eight per cent of Soviet and 62 per cent of US schoolchildren answered in the affirmative, while 4 and 16 per cent respectively answered "no".

/13104  
CSO: 1812/171

## UNITED STATES AND CANADA

### PONOMAREV EXPOUNDS ON U.S. NEOGLOBALISM

Moscow PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN' in Russian No 5, Mar 87 pp 73-77

[Article by Academician P. Ponomarev: "The Historical Doom of the Imperial Policy of Neoglobalism"]

[Text] The activity of the current American administration is distinguished by the fact that it has placed itself at the head not only of the political, but also the ideological struggle against all progressive, liberation and peace-loving forces of the present day. Not a week passes when there are no speeches from the White House command relating to the sphere of ideology and to social problems. But it is characteristic that they do not touch on such questions in the internal life of the United States itself, although, it would seem, according to the Constitution the government is called upon to concern itself with them; all the more so because, as is well known, there is a great multitude of domestic problems in the United States. Millions upon millions of Americans are suffering from the fact that its domestic problems--from unemployment, poverty, racial oppression, drug addiction, etc.--have not been solved.

For some time, the American administration has advanced a conception which journalists and public circles have called neoglobalist. President R. Reagan, in a number of wordy documents, has tried in one way or another to justify its necessity and to receive the approval of Congress, the American public, and large appropriations in terms of the state budget for this. In so doing, he openly and without ceremony set forth the essence of his doctrine. "The interests of the United States go far beyond the limits of our boundaries, they exist in the remaining part of the Western Hemisphere, in Europe, in the Pacific Ocean, in the Near East, and in other regions," it is stated in one of those documents, "requiring strong, confident, and consistent American leadership."

Thereby, without ceremony and unambiguously, claims are advanced concerning "American leadership", i. e., supremacy throughout the entire world. What is more, the enumeration of the regions clearly indicates the aspiration to play the master everywhere in the world. Hence the characterization of this doctrine as global, in other words, as extending to the whole world. It proclaims a policy line aimed at direct interference in the internal affairs of other states under the guise of defense of "democracy" and "freedom."

Neoglobalism embodies the imperial policy of social revenge and the opposition and direct suppression of any progressive, democratic, and national liberation movement. With its edge it is directed against socialism, against the Soviet Union and the entire socialist commonwealth. According to the doctrine, the United States can utilize all means available to it up to and including military force in order not to allow the development of events in any country, above all in the countries of the "Third World", which do not suit Washington.

The aim of the indicated policy is to legitimize the use of any measures, including military intervention, in relation to independent states whose domestic order and policy are not to the liking of American imperialism. Hence also the justification of the senseless, historically unprecedented arms race, including nuclear missile arms, the maintenance of a large army, the creation of "rapid deployment forces," and other sinister actions, leading to the outburst of militarism in the United States and to the preparation of nuclear war.

In spite of the warnings of the peace-loving forces, in spite of the will of all nations, the United States, on 3 and 11 February, carried out underground nuclear explosions in the testing area in the state of Nevada. This called forth a wave of universal indignation and protest. In many countries mass manifestations are being held. Their participants demand that the United States stop nuclear tests and listen to world public opinion coming out in favor of the prevention of the nuclear threat.

An extremely precise characterization of neoglobalism was given by the American newspaper NEW YORK TIMES. The source of this theory is the right-wing camp in ideology, which to a large degree determines the position of the Reagan Administration. This conception consists in the following: "The United States must intervene everywhere where there is any kind of possibility to fight against Soviet or Marxist influence. It must do this throughout the world, without taking into consideration the peculiarities of local conditions."

The special danger of neoglobalism consists in the fact that this policy is embodied in practice in the form of direct aggressive actions of American imperialism on a truly global scale. The overthrow of the progressive regime in Grenada, where American troops were introduced and the country was occupied, was achieved. An attack on Libya was carried out; it is subjected to an economic boycott and other hostile actions. Comprehensive support of the bandits in Afghanistan is being provided, they are being sent an enormous quantity of American weapons and large amounts of money. For many years, the American administration has been meddling in the internal affairs of Angola, inspiring and materially supporting the counterrevolutionary grouping UNITA. Steadfast support is being given to the military, adventurist actions of the "contras" against the lawful government of Nicaragua. Not being fastidious in the choice of any means, the United States is conducting an undeclared war against Nicaragua. For many years, the American imperialists, together with Israel, have been carrying out aggressive military actions in Lebanon. One cannot count the imperial, hegemonic deeds of the neoglobalists.

An inalienable component of neoglobalism is anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. Assertions of various sorts are being propagated to the effect that it is necessary to defend the "vital interests of the United States" against the

liberation movements of nations in various corners of the Earth, allegedly taking place as the result of the actions of the "hand of Moscow". Not long ago, the chief instigator of the arms race and advocate of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), the secretary of defense C. Weinberger, having attained an increase of the, as it is, colossal military budget of the United States to 312 billion dollars, declared without beating about the bush: "In every corner of the globe, the vitally important interests of America are in danger because of the growing Soviet military threat."

Fabrications about Soviet policy with respect to other countries are constantly being disseminated from the upper echelons of the American administration. Many of the views overstep all bounds of the permissible and all limits of civilized international relations. Thus, the President of the United States, in his speech of 6 October 1986, asserted that "the peoples of Central America, Africa, and Southeast Asia are experiencing terrible suffering as the result of Soviet invasion or military intervention."

As is well known to the entire world, in the policy of the USSR there is nothing of the sort that is attributed to it in the indicated and other slanderous assertions, and there never was. But, obviously, the advocates of neoglobalism adhere to the rule--the greater the lie, the greater the chances that someone will believe it.

To disseminate its doctrine of neoglobalism in the world and to strengthen its influence on the population of foreign countries, above all the socialist countries, the United States has created an unprecedented, colossal propaganda apparatus. Day and night the radio stations "Voice of America", "Liberty", "Free Europe", and "Deutsche Welle" [German Wave], and others conduct such propaganda. A special governmental organ for propaganda abroad, the USIA, publishes dozens of newspapers, magazines, and books, spreading untruth and fabrication in regard to the theory and practice of socialism, the foreign policy of the socialist countries, and the non-aligned states. The kindling of hatred for the USSR is also served by the anti-Soviet television serial "Amerika" which is presently being shown in the United States.

"The siren of a "crusade" against communism, which had grown quiet, has been turned on to full power. They declare that disarmament is impossible as long as existing procedures and communist ideology are preserved in the Soviet Union. And this is being said by the very people who are accusing us, communists, of being inclined to forcefully foist our views on the entire world!" M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has emphasized.

What are the reasons for all of this? The most important of them is concealed in the reactionary, conservative "credo" of the authors of neoglobalism. Being attached to imperialist ideology, having links with the military-industrial complex, and being supporters of the stability of an order of exploitation and oppression, these figures strive to stop the course of history and even to make it go backwards. To bring it back to those times when only capitalism ruled in the world, when there was only a system of the exploitation of man by man, and when the imperialist states dictated their will to the other peoples.

But now, from the time of the Great October Socialist Revolution--soon already 70 years--socialism exists on the earth.

The laws of the development of human society are inexorable, and it is not given to anyone to stop them. The progress of mankind and the revolutionary changes in the world have taken place in one country after another. Only profound ignorance in the sphere of socio-economic processes can nourish doctrines similar to neoglobalism.

Aspiring to mask the real aggressive essence of the doctrine of neoglobalism, the representatives of the American administration saturate all of their latest speeches with demagogic assertions about "the defense of democracy," about "the freedom of nations," and even. . . about the defense of peace, although the entire activity of this very administration is oriented toward the untwisting of the arms race.

Although the doctrine of neoglobalism and the fabrications of anti-Sovietism are groundless and deprived of any sort of foundations, they are not at all harmless. The harm inflicted on mankind by the neoglobalist policy is enormous. First of all, as a result of this policy, thousands upon thousands of people are perishing in various corners of the planet. Secondly, neoglobalism poisons the atmosphere of relations among nations, including between the peoples of the United States and the USSR, confuses people, trying to call forth fear and enmity to the Soviet country in them and justifies the outburst of militarism and the untwisting of the arms race.

The facts of actual reality and the real state of affairs convincingly disprove the slanderous assertions of the doctrine of neoglobalism. At present one and a half billion people on the earth are going along the path of socialism. The participants of the non-alignment movement are advocating a non-nuclear world and a free life, independent of imperialism, in their countries. Such are the steps of history, such is now the path of mankind. And it more and more realizes the danger of the nuclear cataclysm and raises its voice in defense of peace and universal security.

The doctrine of neoglobalism is dictated by the aspiration to justify, in the eyes of Americans and the peoples of the NATO countries, the never-ending arms race and its transfer into space, to justify the ominous SDI.

One of the tasks of neoglobalism is to divert the attention of the American people from domestic difficulties: From the colossal unemployment, the enormous foreign debt, the reduction of appropriations for social needs (pensions, education), from the inability to cope with drug addiction and crime, etc. And, finally, the persistent propaganda of neoglobalism and the assertion concerning "the Soviet military threat" to the West are called upon to justify the unending interference, up to and including intervention, in the affairs of independent states.

Neoglobalism, from beginning to end, is permeated with the imperial ambitions of the American administration, the open aim at the force of arms, and the disregard for generally-recognized international legal principles. Hence the adventurist actions with respect to other states. But this also leads to shameful

failures of such a policy. For a number of months already, the American people and the entire world are the witnesses of "Irangate". In the course of this affair, the sale of American arms to Iran was carried out, and the money received was handed turned over to the Nicaraguan "contras".

In seeking to achieve the realization of the policy of neoglobalism, the United States is continuing and intensifying the production of all types of weapons. Not long ago, the American administration repudiated the SALT-2 Agreement concluded with the Soviet Union, which was aimed at putting a stop to the arms race. At present the creation and development of the strategic MX and "Midgetman", the "Trident" submarines, the large B-1B bombers, and other means of an aggressive character, are underway. The SDI space weapon is being persistently prepared. There is direct evidence that the aspiration of militant imperialist circles of the United States is to break the military-strategic parity and attain nuclear superiority.

In the contemporary situation, our foreign policy, it was noted at the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, is being tested for "firmness and consistency in the defense of peace, for flexibility and tenacity in the conditions of a feverish arms race fanned by imperialism and international tension forced by it."

In the international arena, the aggressive policy of neoglobalism is opposed by the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union. Our country proclaims and firmly and consistently defends the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of states with a different social order. This policy is secured in the Basic Law--the Constitution of the USSR. In the just struggle for the strengthening of peace, the Soviet Union comes out together with the other countries of the socialist commonwealth.

In contrast to the logic of neoglobalism, the USSR and the other socialist countries demonstrate an innovative approach to world affairs in the interests of all mankind. The practical steps of the USSR speak eloquently about this. In recent times our country has unfolded especially energetic activity in the international arena--activity which answers the interests of all nations.

There was a broad response throughout the entire world to the Declaration of M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in which a broad-scale program was advanced for the creation, by the end of the century, of a nuclear-free world and the phased elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons. Its realization is called upon to secure the elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe and the survival of mankind, which in our time is the decisive task for all governments, parliaments and social movements. This requires new political thinking of all who are interested in the preservation of life on earth.

The 27th CPSU Congress advanced the conception of the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. On behalf of the Soviet Union, this proposal was introduced in the United Nations Organization.

Together with its Warsaw Pact allies, the USSR, in June of 1986, advanced a proposal about the comprehensive and deep reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe--from the Atlantic to the Urals.



At the Soviet-American meeting at the summit level in Reykjavik, important proposals were advanced by the Soviet Union, which were aimed at the comprehensive and deep reduction and then also the elimination of nuclear and other weapons on earth and their non-admission in space. An inspiring prospect of the deliverance of mankind from nuclear catastrophe was opened up. But the President of the United States, in the final analysis, did not meet the Soviet proposals half-way.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it did not and does not take back its proposals. On the contrary, it regards it as important to attain the realization of its concrete proposals advanced in Reykjavik. It is up to the other side, up to the United States of America. The Soviet leadership invariably comes out in favor of dialogue with all states, including with the United States, and many times has shown wise initiative.

In his speech before the participants of the international forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Mankind," which was held in Moscow, M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, emphasized: "... our international policy, more so than ever before, is determined by domestic policy, by our interest in concentrating ourselves in creative work on the improvement of our country. It is precisely for this reason that we need a strong peace, the predictability and constructive orientation of international relations."

The active foreign policy of the USSR and the large-scale program of the prevention of nuclear war, advanced in the Declaration of 15 January 1986, the proposal concerning an all-encompassing system of international security, the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, and other Soviet proposals and measures open up a prospect for the prevention of nuclear war that inspires the nations.

At the same time, they, first of all, convincingly expose the myth of bourgeois propaganda about "the Soviet military threat" to the West. The proposals of the USSR, for example, the moratorium on nuclear tests, are also exactly aimed at the reduction and cessation of all arms, including Soviet arms as well. Secondly, as the result of the activity of the USSR in the international arena, the attention of all nations is focused on the ominous danger of a nuclear war and the danger of the destruction of mankind in the case of the use of nuclear weapons by imperialism. And this induces broad masses of the people to active opposition to the arms race and the preparation of nuclear war. Thirdly, the constant and consistent proposals of the USSR with respect to the reduction of arms and armed forces and the obstinate refusal of the United States to reduce armaments and their build-up and the fanatic idea about the militarization of space--SDI--show people from where, from what country, the danger of war originates.

Realizing this danger, the nations of the world express profound concern with the escalation of the arms race, the danger of its expansion into outer space, and the complication of the situation in the world through the fault of the imperialist forces. They note the special significance of the Soviet program for the creation, by the end of this century, of a nuclear-free world and the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction.

The USSR Supreme Soviet, expressing the will of the entire Soviet people, adopted at its session of 19 November 1986 the appeal "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World," in which it advanced a broad program of measures for the reduction and elimination of nuclear and other arms. In this extremely responsible, perhaps, decisive moment of the history of mankind, the Supreme Soviet turns to all parliaments with an appeal to decisively come out in favor of the practical transition to the construction of a nuclear-free world and the creation of reliable security equal for all states, it is stated in the appeal.

Of outstanding significance is the Delhi Declaration, signed by M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the prime minister of India, R. Gandhi. The leaders of the two countries with a population of more than 1 billion people turned with a passionate appeal to the peoples and leaders of all countries to undertake urgent actions, which must lead to the creation of a world without weapons of mass destruction, without war.

"Great is the danger hanging over mankind. But it has at its disposal great forces to prevent catastrophe and to build a path to civilization without nuclear weapons," it is stated in the Declaration. Gathering the strength of a coalition of peace, which combines the efforts of the movement of non-alignment, a group of six countries, and all peace-loving countries, political parties and public organizations, gives us reason for hope and optimism. The time for resolute and urgent actions has begun."

Such is the program of the new thinking, the policy of active operations on behalf of the solution of the most vital question for all of mankind--deliverance from the threat of nuclear war.

The Program of the CPSU, approved by the 27th Congress, contains the basic idea which serves as guidance to our actions. The Communist Party proceeds from the fact that the historic controversy between the two opposed social systems, into which the contemporary world is divided, can and must be resolved peacefully. Socialism demonstrates its advantages not by the force of arms, but by the force of example in all spheres of social life--by the dynamic development of the economy, science and culture, by the increase of the standard of living of the workers and by the deepening of socialist democracy. The decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee are the convincing confirmation of the peaceful and creative aspirations of the Soviet communists and all Soviet people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Partiynaya zhizn", 1987.

8970

CSO: 1807/246A

LITERARY JOURNAL ON U.S.,CIA USE OF RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS

[Editorial report] Moscow OKTYABR in Russian Nos 2 (pp 155-183) and 3 (136-170) 1987 publishes an article by N. Yakovlev entitled "The CIA Against the USSR: The Lord and the Bomb." The author examines the role of religion in forming, justifying, and helping to implement U.S. policy vis a vis the USSR. He says that "it would, of course, be an exaggeration to state that the United States is now on the way to becoming a theocracy," but he points out the support given the current administration by religious groups, Jerry Falwell's in particular. He traces the tie between religion and government from the First Amendment in 1791 until today and cites Gallup polls and other studies in the 1980's to document the role of the church in everyday American life.

A lengthy section is devoted to the influence of Martin Luther King and Fundamentalists, such as Falwell, on events in the U.S. and of religion on President Jimmy Carter and the Moral Majority on President Regan. The importance of Israel, Zionists, and the Jewish press is also addressed.

The anti-communist, anti-Soviet position of the Fundamentalists is documented and labeled "a direct threat to the peace and security of peoples." Further: "The Fundamentalists openly, passionately, and with conviction not only defend the moral admissibility of nuclear weapons, but also oppose with equal energy any limitation on their use. In this regard J. Falwell is carrying out the direct instructions of official Washington."

The personal beliefs of Ronald Regan concerning Armageddon, nuclear war, school prayer, and the role of religion in U.S. political life are discussed.

In Section 3 Yakovlev reports CIA and other "special services'" use of various churches such as the Orthodox, Uniate, and Catholic churches for intelligence purposes. The following quote is identified only as from "one American research paper": "In the fall of 1975 the White House and CIA acknowledged that missionaries were being used abroad to collect information. An investigation by the American Senate exposed the existence of 14 'secret agreements' dealing with 'direct operative use' of 21 American missionaries and priests."

A lengthy discussion of the history of the use of religion, including the Vatican, by special services in the U.S. and other capitalist countries follows, with emphasis on the USSR, including religious groups within that country, as their target.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda". "Oktyabr", 1987.

UNITED STATES AND CANADA

U.S. CAMPAIGN AGAINST DRUGS CALLED 'SISYPHEAN'

Moscow TRUD in Russian 7 Feb 87 p 3

[Article by A. Burmistenko, TRUD correspondent: "A Nirvana That Kills"; first paragraph is letter from a reader]

[Text] Washington -- Currently a great deal is being written about drug addiction. It is a well-known fact that this is most widespread in the United States. How is it being combatted there?

-- I. Kuleshov, Kazan

In America you see them everywhere, importunate, shifty individuals with furtive eyes, dressed, as a rule, in dark jackets or tattered overcoats. Slipping out of an alleyway or a store entrance, they come up close to your side and mutter, almost directly in your ear: "Crack, crack, crack," "Grass, I've got grass," or "Angel dust. You want angel dust?" Some people eagerly exchange a \$10 or \$20 bill for a thin, hand-rolled cigarette or tiny plastic bubble containing a yellowish-white powder.

Hundreds of thousand, millions of such transactions are made every day throughout the immense territory of the United States. Their effect could be compared to a devastating epidemic. At a scale unprecedented for any industrially developed country, drug addiction in the United States is crippling lives, destroying families, increasing crime and occupational injuries and corrupting pop-music and sports idols. Americans spend more for illegal drugs than they do for automobiles: even according to obviously low government estimates this passion for a drug nirvana costs the national economy \$110 billion annually. "Drugs are threatening our society, threatening our values and undermining our institutions," President Reagan was forced to admit. "They are killing our children."

It is rather difficult to get a full idea of the scale of this crisis. However, the statistical data which are periodically published by the federal Drug Enforcement Agency and the National Institute on Drug Abuse are mind-boggling. According to data for 1985, a total of 70.4 million Americans above the age of 12 (37 percent of the total U.S. population) had tried marijuana, cocaine, heroin or other drugs at least once. A total of 36.8 million Americans (19 percent of the total population) had used drugs within the year

prior to the survey and 23 million (12 percent of the population) had used drugs during the month prior to the survey.

The cautious formulations contained in statistical accounts do not reveal the whole picture. A narcotic once tried means for many people a quickly-acquired habit -- outright drug addiction. Cocaine molecules reach the brain in less than 10 seconds. A 10- to 20-minute state of euphoria is followed by an equally swift and destructive depression and the overwhelming desire for another dose. According to data from many American experts, this sort of alternating cycle can lead to severe physical and psychological drug dependence within two weeks.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse is located on several floors of a huge administrative building in Rockville, not far from Washington.

"My urgent advice to everyone is: never mess around with drugs," I was told by Peter (Hartsouk), a professor at the institute. "The risk of becoming an inveterate drug addict is so great, and drug addiction is so difficult to treat, that it is better not to tempt fate. Especially now, since the appearance of 'crack' (a variety of cocaine notable for its powerful and swift effect) and at a time when drug addicts are becoming infected with AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome). Drugs are especially dangerous for young, immature organisms and, of course, for women. Our institute is receiving more and more reports of newborn babies which are already addicted to the narcotics taken by their mothers. They are doomed from the moment they are born; for them drug addiction is quite literally a congenital illness."

In the opinion of a majority of experts, it is virtually impossible to solve the drug problem under the conditions existing in the United States. Because it is not enough just to diagnose an illness. Methods of treatment must also be found. It cannot be said that nothing is being done in this country to combat drug addiction. Large budget allocations have been made for that purpose and there is a powerful federal agency assigned to the fight against drugs well as special police units, a network of drug abuse clinics and round-the-clock drug "hotlines" -- special telephone numbers which can be called to receive expert advice and first aid. Nationwide antidrug campaigns are conducted periodically.

Yet despite all the proclamations and promises by the President himself and by other politicians, despite propaganda campaigns and police raids, the struggle is reminiscent of the labors of Sisyphus. The scale of the crisis is already too great, America is already too deeply mired in this ruinous vice, which is the product of social ills, unemployment and a feeling of despair on the part of millions of people, all of these factors exacerbated by the notorious American "permissiveness."

Another aspect of the problem is the fact that demand creates supply, and the dirty drug industry is today the most profitable business in the United States. In it, the commanding heights are occupied by the Mafia, which has covered the country with a gigantic network of "dealers" and "pushers." The economics are exceedingly simple. An average dealer (narcotics merchant) buys an ounce of pure cocaine at wholesale for roughly \$1,000. One ounce contains

28 grams, and each gram of cocaine will yield six doses of "crack," each of which is then sold on street corners for \$20-\$25. Thus, each ounce of cocaine makes a total of \$3,200 pure profit for the dealer. The dealers in turn hire whole groups of pushers, who are the ones who sell drugs directly to the buyers and, with a certain amount of hustle, can make \$100 to \$200 per day.

The rapid turnover and fantastic profits allow the Mafia to be generous with bribe money. In the United States a week does not go by without scandalous exposés of policemen, customs agents, municipal employees and politicians at various levels who have become involved in cocaine and heroin corruption. "We have had no effect on the situation; the ranks (of drug traffickers) are not getting any thinner," sadly admitted John Cusack, chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. "Quite frankly, exactly the opposite is happening: only a few get caught, and the risk of punishment is so small that we are only encouraging the drug trade."

This sort of graphic admissions are convincing proof that U.S. authorities are losing the war on drug addiction -- a true 20th century American tragedy.

12825

CSO: 1807/198

## THATCHER TV INTERVIEW ASSESSED FROM GLASNOST STANDPOINT

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 15, 19-26 Apr 87 p 4

[Article by Vladimir Simonov]

[Text] A U.S. TEXTBOOK on journalism which I once read said that a reporter who sets out to get an interview always has a coveted dream. The textbook offered the following joke as an illustration.

A reporter asks the president: "Can you please say if you feel a pain somewhere?" The president immediately pulls up his shirt and shows the scar from a recent operation.

What I'm referring to is the interviewee's readiness to satisfy the reporter's curiosity.

For many reasons, we couldn't even dream about this when we were standing in a row to meet Mrs. Thatcher in the lobby of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. We were the three Soviet journalists who got the chance to interview the British Prime Minister on Soviet TV. We carried typewritten sheets of paper with carefully thought-out questions, and we had the acute feeling that we were the first to tread a path hitherto unknown to Soviet journalists.

Mrs. Thatcher arrived slightly late. She gave each of us a heartfelt handshake, took her place on the sofa and adjusted the earphone for the simultaneous translation. "Let's test how well we can hear the translator," she said. "Please, say something. Aha. Please raise the sound volume, so that your speech wouldn't jam the translation. Aha. That's splendid. Now, tell me, please, how does my voice sound on the audio channels? Should we move the mike nearer? Or should I move closer to the mike? There's no need to? All right. That's splendid. Now, tell me, please, does a red light go on on your cameras when it transmits the picture?"

Boris Kalyagin, a TV representative, said that the red light did not go on. "Then how am I to know that the camera is working?" said the Prime Minister in amazement. Kalyagin, realizing that what was meant was the start of the broadcast, promised obligingly that he would give the signal with his hand. Mrs. Thatcher looked at him with extreme curiosity.

A veteran pro of TV shows she, of course, precisely wished to know which of the three cameras was working at the given moment, to be

able, if need be, to address herself directly to the TV audience and look the TV viewer in the eye. And that, by the way, is what she did do at the close of the interview. But at the beginning the warrior was sizing up the weapons, so to say.

Then the law according to which the piece of bread always falls on the side it is buttered on, went into operation. Adjusting some wires, a technician upset a floor vase with roses. The flowers gracefully fell at the feet of Mrs. Thatcher. She said humorously: "Well, since it all begins like this, then the interview will go well!" And, true enough, it passed quite well for her.

The first two questions failed to produce any surprises. The Premier delivered quite a few nice words on the big impression made on her by the talks with the Soviet leader, and the constructive and sincere atmosphere of the visit.

It all started at the moment when Tomas Kolesnichenko, an experienced Pravda correspondent, already hardened by battles on US TV, asked Mrs. Thatcher whether, in her opinion, a statesman needs a new way of thinking in our time. The question was in accord with our scenario. Because we, of course, did have such an approximate scenario, or, rather, a list of questions and the sequence in which we were to ask them. That is the usual procedure. No Western reporter would interview even a door-man using only improvisation.

Mrs. Thatcher demonstrated something quite different - the high, polished by ages, and set in hoary tradition, Oxford school of oratory. The same art that helped her rise from the bench in Parliament to 10 Downing Street, and that still helps her in the fierce cross examinations at debates in Westminster.

An attentive watcher could notice that the Premier, essentially, did not answer our questions on arms control. Capitalizing on half-a-sentence, or even on some single word, she gave the TV viewer blocks of information embracing the entire range of the subjects important for her.

According to her, the nuclear bomb was a blessing for the globe, including (if we speak logically) also Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the past 40 years of peace are only a result of the fear of the bomb. And the more bombs there were, the more peaceful life would be for all of us, earthmen.

Now we are getting nearer to what is the main thing – how to assess this interview. "How to assess it?" the reader might cry. "Why, of course, it was a failure for you, if not a complete flop."

Another section of the viewers (many of them telephoned us) also think that the interview was a failure on our part, but for quite a different reason. They say that some of us were too much aggressive, interrupted their colleagues, and so on.

The public confusion was so great that rumours started to spread. It was said that Kuryagin was (for one) dismissed from the TV screen and that we would not see him any more! Simonov was exiled as the APN correspondent to the Kurile Islands. And Kolesnichenko was demoted all the way down to a cloakroom attendant. And that's that.

And, it looks like very few people are trying to realize what we had witnessed really in this case. I'll allow myself to put it in the following way – it was an unprecedented example of expression of openness in history of Soviet TV. And, true enough, have you ever before seen such a major interview of a Western leader on our TV? No, you haven't. We only read the questions and answers that our journalists had exchanged in their time with President Reagan.

In the long run, according to all the laws of reporting, an interview is a genre which is aimed at finding out the interviewee's point of view on various problems and at helping the reader or the spectator get to know the person who is being interviewed better as a personality. Do we know Mrs. Thatcher better after 45 minutes we spent with her on the air? Do we have a more accurate idea now of this strong-willed and determined defender of dangerous theories?

Of course, we do.

Therefore, the classic task of the interview was fulfilled.

But both the journalists who took the interview and the TV viewers feel dissatisfied. I wonder if the blame lies with us. Maybe, we ourselves are not yet prepared for the problem which faced us on the TV screen last week? We feel somewhat lost when we're granted the right to decide for ourselves what it was that we had seen on the TV. We still need a mentor, a sort of professor with a portfolio and a pointer in his hand who would explain to us what is good and what is evil.

No, it wasn't a discussion! It wasn't a round table to which we are already getting accustomed. It was a pure interview. I think that it was exactly the newness of the genre that had surprised so many people by its unusualness.

The greatest authority on interviews in the USA is probably Barbara Walters. This pretty and charming blonde peppered, with her transparent, seemingly artless questions which somehow are always to the point – so many celebrities – kings, sheiks, tycoons, movie stars, and so on. Barbara wrote a book called *How To Talk*

*with Practically Anybody About Practically Anything*. I've yet to see a more brilliant textbook on journalism.

The book is subdivided into small chapters: how to speak with celebrities, how to speak with diplomats, how to speak with clergy, with military men, with old men, or with alcoholics. And only one chapter has a longer title: "How To Speak With Politicians, AVOIDING ARGUMENTS WITH THEM" (Barbara Walters's italics – V.S.).

She says that this is the hardest thing to do. Otherwise the interview is doomed to failure. "If you feel a dire need to attack a politician with words, then do so." Miss Walters warns her colleagues. "But in this case you will not achieve anything, because you won't be able in any way to persuade him and you'll lose the opportunity to see inside his way of thinking."

Of course, different genres are employed by Western TV. On the Crossfire channel of the US CNN network, the interviewee is attacked by two journalists, a conservative and a liberal. In this case it is allowed to interrupt the person being interviewed and to subject him or her to risky questions, bordering on insults, to make them feel uncomfortable. But that is a different thing. Such conditions are stipulated beforehand, and the victim knows what he or she is in for. And, naturally, such an interview is not suitable for a head of state.

The error some of us did make, as I see it, was precisely that we deviated from the form of the classic interview. In making attempts (as it was in the old times) to prove something to someone or to subject them to petty "pinpricks". In the long run, all that means expressing non-confidence in the TV audience's ability to reason for itself. Openness, as we see, offers tough problems even to those who must create it in line with their professional duties.

My question of a private nature to Mrs. Thatcher also caused a lot of talk. I asked her how much she sleeps, what she prefers for breakfast, and whether it is a great stress for her to cope with her duties as Premier's, remaining the head of the house and mother of two children. A woman who watched the interview phoned me and scolded me, "on behalf of a group of Soviet working women", for permitting myself, as she put it, "to rummage in the personal wardrobe" of a foreign Prime Minister.

I think, this is also a good example of our unpreparedness for openness. We regard human interest in a leader's life well-nigh a sacrilege. But why? This is after all nothing but an expression of respect for the human factor on the part of journalism.

Therefore, the reader might ask, what lesson did Vladimir Simonov, an APN political analyst, learn from the interview with the British Prime Minister which caused such a stir?

It is only in Alice's Wonderland that the three gardeners were repainting white roses red. It is no use doing that in real life.

And one other thing. One should be better prepared.



## EASTERN EUROPE

### RSFSR FOREIGN MINISTER ON SERBIA, MONTENEGRO VISIT, TIES

[Interview with RSFSR Foreign Minister V.M. Vinogradov by correspondent A. Nazarov: "Cooperation Is Strengthening"--date and place of interview not specified; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] RSFSR Foreign Minister V.M. Vinogradov has been in Yugoslavia, visiting Serbia and Montenegro. Our correspondent, A. Nazarov, asked him to talk about the results of his trip.

[V.M. Vinogradov] Two years ago, when the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, V.I. Vorotnikov, visited Serbia and Montenegro, cooperation programs were signed in Belgrade and Titograd. They served to strengthen and develop the relations between our two countries. The experience of preparing such programs has proved very useful. And during our visit, which took place at the invitation of the executive councils of both republics' assemblies, we came to the conclusion that it would be expedient to prepare in advance programs for the main areas of cooperation through the year 1990. These will embrace economic, scientific, technical, and cultural questions. In a word, the characteristic trait of our ties--their stable development--will be continued.

We are ascending to a new level. These programs will both widen and deepen the ties. And above all they will put them on a solid foundation: The influence of the foreign market will be reduced and there will be an increase in the volume and variety of goods. We will engage in cooperative production [kooperatsiya]: This can also take the form of joint enterprises. Output will be geared to both the domestic and foreign markets. Joint construction is arousing interest. As a result of surplus manpower Yugoslav organizations are interested in this and, possibly, we will also join up with third countries. In the scientific and technical sphere we are concentrating our joint efforts on the most modern achievements--for their speediest introduction into technological practice. As regards cultural links, it is possible that next year will see RSFSR festivals in Serbia and Montenegro. Another interesting format is the renewal of contacts between the Makarov Higher Nautical College in Leningrad and the naval faculty in the city of Kotor. Peter the Great sent future naval commanders there to study. In the Kotor College I saw the portraits of those 16 sailors eagerly awaited by the young Russian fleet.... These, I suppose, are the main areas of our projected programs.

I would like to mention the very interesting and informative discussions I had with D. Ckrebic, member of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, and

R. Dizdarevic, federal secretary for foreign affairs. They touched on Soviet-Yugoslav relations and major international problems affecting our two countries. During the visit questions were constantly asked about the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum. I informed our Yugoslav comrades in detail of our efforts toward the fuller exploitation of the advantages of socialism for economic and social development. This aroused exceptionally great interest on the part of all our interlocutors. Our foreign policy initiatives aimed at ending the arms race and creating a system of security for everyone are rated highly. The draft programs which have been drawn up will be signed in the near future by the heads of our governments, and this will serve as a new impetus to our cooperation.

/12232

CSO: 1807/291

## EASTERN EUROPE

### CZECHS PROCESS FOODS DIRECTLY AT AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVES

[Editorial report] Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 6 Mar 87 p 3 carries an article "An Industrial Shop in Blatnice" which discusses Czech experience in the production of prepared food products directly at agricultural enterprises. The author, special correspondent S. Romerantsev, identifies South Moravia as the leading area of the CSSR in this field and details the operation at the Budoucnost cooperative in the village of Blatnice, which includes a computer center with 8 terminals. The cooperative first saw the economic benefit of producing milk products locally when milk produced in the area had to be processed at a town 50 km away. Prior to building the shop, the author noted, they had to decide what products would be able to compete on the Czech market and turn a profit. Traditional delicatessen cheeses were chosen, and production began in 1985. The operation was successful and has expanded into mushroom production. The cooperative is currently considering a further expansion into the production of meat items.

CSO:18 25/135-P

## EASTERN EUROPE

### BULGARIAN-SOVIET CORN SELECTION PROJECT DELAYS

[Editorial report] Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Apr 87 p 3 reports the formation of a "joint Soviet-Bulgarian association for corn selection and seed raising which will become one of the main links of an institute in Knezha," Bulgaria. The association will "combine the potential of both countries to improve the selection of new varieites and hybrids of this crop, as well as its production. However, it must be noted that the implementation of this project is proceeding extremely slowly" despite last year's high level inter-government decision. The article concludes by noting that things are moving slowly at the executive level and that "no one is benefitting from this."

CS0:18 25/171-P

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### LATIN AMERICA INSTITUTE DIRECTOR VOLSKIY ON DEBT CRISIS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Feb 87 p 5

[Interview with Viktor Vatslavovich Volskiy, director of the Latin America Institute and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by A. Cherepanov, IZVESTIYA correspondent: "The Debt Quagmire: Is There Any Way Out?"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Foreign debt permeates the Latin American continent like a cancerous tumor. Divided among the total population of Latin America, including infants, debts to the West would total over \$1,000 per capita. That is more than the average annual wage in Latin America. Each year more than \$100 billion finds its way from the countries of Latin America into the safes of Western banks and multinational corporations, mainly in the United States. The interest alone on the region's public debt to its creditors is over 35 percent of total annual receipts from exports. For Latin America, as for the entire developing world, the debt crisis has become problem #1, leading to unforeseeable consequences in both the socioeconomic and the political realms.

But this problem is perhaps most acute in Latin America, which owes the United States and its allies almost one-half of all money loaned to developing countries. This is attested to by the decision made a few days ago by Brazil, in economic terms the most highly developed Latin American country, to halt interest payments on its foreign debt for 90 days on account of the impossibility of coming up with ever more billions of dollars. Over the next three months the country will not transfer abroad two billion dollars in the form of interest for the first half of this year alone. As Brazilian president Jose Sarney stated, this step was absolutely necessary, because foreign debts are threatening the very future of the Brazilian national economy. The presidents of Argentina, Uruguay and Venezuela have already expressed their support for and solidarity with Brazil's decision. We asked V. V. Volskiy to share his opinions on this subject with our readers.

[Volskiy] At the end of last year Latin American countries' foreign debt was over \$400 billion. As you can see, a truly astronomical figure. And it continues to grow. The question arises: can such a debt even be paid? If the answer is yes, then how? If no, then why?

Our institute, together with the USSR Academy of Sciences Main Data Processing Center, has calculated on a computer over 1,000 alternatives for paying the continent's debt. These calculations indicate that under the economic conditions which currently prevail in the world there exists no possibility of liquidating the debt. Even according to the optimum scenario the total sum of foreign debts would decrease only slightly by the year 2000.

And most likely -- if we take the actual state of affairs in the world capitalist economy as our starting point -- Latin America's debt will continue to grow, and by the beginning of the coming century will total between 700 and 720 billion dollars. The problem is that the causes which have given rise to the debt continue to exist.

[Interviewer] Viktor Vatslavovich, are not many countries in Latin America nevertheless making efforts to solve their foreign debt problem? Take Peru, for instance.

[Volskiy] We also calculated the so-called "Peruvian alternative." Peru is not paying more than 10 percent of its export receipts to service its debt. Yes, the country's economy has experienced some temporary relief. But this relief is precisely that, temporary. The problem cannot be solved by paying only 10 percent. Firstly, income from exports is growing extremely slowly. Secondly, in order to pay off the debt in a normal manner, Peru's entire receipts from exports would not suffice. In the "Peruvian alternative" debts do not decrease, but rather continue to increase. To this I should add that, on account of the ill will of the IMF and other organizations of that type, the [Peruvian] state can no longer obtain major loans.

[Interviewer] But continuing growth of foreign indebtedness could lead to the most unpredictable consequences, to a financial "explosion," so to speak. Can it be that the United States, its allies and the international monetary organizations which they control do not realize this?

[Volskiy] Why not? They understand that perfectly well. They are counting on the fact that such a situation cannot go on, that a way out of the current dead end must be found. They learned a lot from the crisis at the beginning of the 1980's; it made them realize that a critical situation must not be brought to an extreme point. Therefore currently the West's strategy is to keep the illness hidden.

Having turned indebtedness into a chronic ailment, the United States and its allies are now attempting to treat it. They are attempting to make the IMF, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Club of Paris into, in a manner of speaking, the collective Aesculapius of Latin America, which will make it possible for them to dictate their terms. This involves the conducting of negotiations with only one specific state at a time, in no event doing so with a group of countries, much less with the entire "Third World."

[Interviewer] Is it possible to speak of developing countries -- including those in Latin America -- as having achieved unity in the face of this sort of "debt aggression" by the West?

[Volskiy] At this point we cannot say that. The actions of some countries in Latin America suffer from indecisiveness, despite the fact that they have already been shown the path to unity. Several years ago the Cartagena Group was created in Latin America for the purpose of seeking a way out of debt servitude. But no unified strategic course which would be acceptable to everyone was ever worked out. The rules of the game laid down by a consortium of Western countries are simply too dominant -- even in psychological terms.

In December of last year an Argentine-Brazilian summit meeting was held in Brasilia. The main topic of the negotiations was the foreign debt problem. But thus far no concrete solution has been found.

[Interviewer] You said that every Latin American country is attempting to find its own way out of the dead end street of debt. What will be the end result of that?

[Volskiy] In the end they will have to make concessions and submit to the IMF's conditions. Each country is hoping to reach an agreement from a more advantageous position than its neighbors. Under pressure from the West many Latin American states are beginning to sell enterprises in the state sector of their economies in order to pay off their debts. For example, over the past year alone Mexico lost a total of 220 state-run enterprises in this fashion. Mexico took this unprecedented step for the first time after many years of following a strict policy of state control over the economy; it was forbidden for foreign companies to own more than 49 percent of the stock in any Mexican enterprise. What this actually amounts to is the "pawning" of national wealth, and it hardly seems likely that they will be able to buy it back at a later time.

You may ask: what will be the consequences of such a policy? Basically, the multinational corporations, international banks and monetary and financial organizations are acquiring control over the economies of Latin American countries to an extent unheard of even under present conditions. We should bear in mind the fact that the state sector, especially in such large countries as Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, serves as a backer for the nation's private capital, which would be unable to compete with the multinationals on its own.

And perhaps the most important point: foreign debt, having become an integral part of an economic crisis of unprecedented proportions in Latin America, is leading to erosion of the sociopolitical realm, destabilizing the internal political situation in states in that region and weighing heavily on the shoulders of, primarily, the small owners and indigent classes. The debt crisis has further exacerbated such problems as mass unemployment, high mortality rates and poverty.

[Interviewer] Viktor Vatslavovich, one of the reasons for the tremendous growth of Latin American states' foreign debt has been the arms race unleashed by the United States and its NATO allies. Could you also briefly explain this aspect of the problem to our readers?

[Volskiy] The aggressive, power-based policy of the Reagan Administration in the international arena naturally requires huge and constantly growing expenditures by the United States for armaments. With its huge budget deficit even a power like the United States is not capable of financing such expenditures. Washington has resorted to transferring capital from developing countries.

Incidentally, debts increase (indirectly, of course) on account of the arms race, which has basically led to a catastrophic rise in the interest rates on loans, which have risen to 23 percent annually. One borrows \$100, but one must pay back \$123.

What does this mean in practical terms? Here are a few figures by way of example. Between 1978 and 1984 Latin America paid almost \$400 billion on its debts. Yet its indebtedness did not decrease. Rather, it increased, snowballing. Whereas in 1978 all the countries in Latin America together owed the West \$220 billion, by the end of last year this sum, as we have seen, had almost doubled. You borrow, and the interest is three, then you borrow again, and the interest is six. And so on, ad infinitum.

But there is more. U.S. policy in the international arena, which is aimed at confrontation and the incitement of regional military conflicts around the world, has also led to the militarization of Latin America itself. In Chile and Paraguay, for example, millions of dollars continue to be wasted on unproductive military expenditures. It has been estimated that Pinochet's fascist regime has spent 65 percent of the loans it has obtained from the West to buy weapons.

[Interviewer] One gets the impression that the problem of foreign debt is essentially unsolvable.

[Volskiy] That is not completely true. There is a solution. And what I mean is a political solution, not merely an economic one. At the 27th CPSU Congress it was proposed that a comprehensive system of international security be created and a new world economic order established. Other measures include a joint search for ways to regulate debt problems fairly, and development of principles for the use, for the good of the world community -- in particular the good of developing countries --, of a portion of the money which will be freed up as a result of reductions in military budgets and an end to the arms race. There is no doubt that all this could help resolve not only the foreign debt problem, but also many other problems in international economic relations.

12825

CSO: 1807/201



## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### TABLE OF CONTENTS: LATINSKAYA AMERIKA No 2, 1987

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 3-4

#### [Text] TABLE OF CONTENTS

##### EDITOR'S COLUMN

On the New Political Thinking	5
Argentina On a New Path (Interview with Raul Ricardo Alfonsin, President of the Republic of Argentina)	7
P.P. Yakovlev. Three Years of Radical Rule	13
M.G. Vats. Uruguay: A Political Panorama	24
We Are Ready to Defend the Rights of the Working People (Conversation with Trade Union Leaders of Uruguay)	31
Yu.G. Onufriyev. A Reformed Village: the Stagnation of Contradictions	36

##### GLOBAL PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT: DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD OCEAN

V.D. Pisarev. On the Utilization of Marine Expanses and Resources [For translation of this article see the section WORLDWIDE TOPICS in this JPRS Report]	48
V.B. Tarasov. The 200-Mile Doctrine: Essence and Significance	61
K.S. Tarasov and A. Yu. Teslenko. Prospects for the Development of the Continental Shelf	66

##### MEETINGS, INTERVIEWS

Cuban Science Today (A Conversation with Rosa Elena Simeon Negrin, President of the Cuban Academy of Sciences)	76
--	----

##### PAGES OF HISTORY

A.F. Shulgovskiy. Mario Briceno-Iragorry, Thinker and Patriot	79
---	----

##### LITERARY JOURNALISM

The Odyssey of Miguel Littin, or A Secret Meeting with the Homeland. Reporting by Gabriel Garcia Marquez (Continuation)	85
---	----

## ART AND LITERATURE

- Modern Cuban Literature: Continuity and Innovation (A Meeting In the Editorial Office) 109

## USSR-LATIN AMERICA

- V.L. Khayt. Ten Centuries of Colombian Architecture 120

## THE BOOKSHELF

### Surveys

- V.I. Gulyayev. Urbanism and Pre-Hispanic Mesoamerica 127

### Reviews

- E.V. Demenchonok. "Carlos Balino--pervyy kubinskiy myslitel-marksist" [Carlos Balino--the First Cuban Marxist Thinker] by Carmen Gomez Garcia 136

- I.K. Shatunovskaya. "Kino stran Latinskoy Ameriki" [The Cinema of the Latin American Countries] 139

- A.P. Alekseyev. "Demograficheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar" [Encyclopedic Demographic Dictionary] 140

## SCHOLARLY LIFE

- Seminar in Bolivia 141  
Georgiy Vladimirovich Stepanov--An Obituary 144

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

8543

CSO: 1807/207

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

REVIEW OF JOURNAL LATINSKAYA AMERIKA NO 2, 1987

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 27 Feb 87 pp 1-4

[Text] The journal features the materials of the press conference given by Argentina's President Raul Alfonsin during his visit to the Soviet Union.

"Three Years of Radical Rule" is the title of an article by P. Yakovlev, the journal's correspondent reporting on South American countries. The most difficult problem for the government of the Civil Radical Union (CRU) [sic] party in Argentina, the author writes, is overcoming the dire legacy in the economic field left by the military regime. In effect, the policy of the "Proceso" period, which is a popular name for the dictatorship years, had exacerbated the negative phenomena which had accumulated in the economy over several decades of instability and perturbations and had led to a considerable weakening of the country's positions. Suffice it to recall that in the period between 1930 and 1985 the per capita gross domestic product in Argentina grew, in fixed prices, by just 50 percent, whereas in Mexico it soared by 200 and in Brazil by 340 percent. Between 1970 and 1985 the GDP in Mexico rose by 32 and in Brazil by 70 percent, whereas in Argentina it dropped by 11.5 percent, from \$2,227 to \$1,971, which brought about a decline of the country's share in the aggregate GDP of the Latin American countries from 14.3 percent in 1970 to 8.8 percent in 1985.

The pivotal point in the economic policy of the Radical government is the search for measures capable of urbing inflation which stood at 25 to 30 percent in the first half of 1985. It was the main obstacle in the way of the rehabilitation of the country's economy and of the necessary structural changes.

An important direction in the foreign-policy activities of the government, notes P. Yakovlev, is the struggle for peace, disarmament and internal security, which is confirmed by statements made by Argentina's representatives in the UN, within the framework of the non-aligned movement and of the Delhi Six. As was clearly illustrated by Raul Alfonsin's official visit to the Soviet Union, the present stage in Soviet-Argentine relations is marked by the coincidence or affinity of the USSR's and Argentina's views concerning the settlement of a number of cardinal international problems and by a common interest in the continuation and development of political, commercial, economic, scientific and technical and cultural relations.

The article, "Uruguay: A Political Panorama," by M. Vats says that the aim of the government of Julio Maria Sanguinetti is to put an end to the country's international isolation as soon as possible, to strengthen its relations with all other countries without exception and intensify its participation in international organizations. Uruguay is now a member of the Latin American Contadora support group, has restored diplomatic relations with Venezuela and Cuba, is developing contacts in many spheres with the USSR, the PRC and other states and has condemned South Africa's apartheid policy.

The Uruguayan government is now intensively studying the question of having the country join non-alignment, in which it has so far been only an "active observer."

However, the coming to power of the liberally-minded part of the bourgeoisie is only a kind of political compromise and does not mean at all that those forces which ruled the country together with military men have completely and voluntarily renounced power. The financial oligarchy, big landlords and manufacturers linked to the multinationals, continue to occupy commanding posts.

The ultra right-wing, even fascist, terroristic groups continue their activities. They are sowing discord among the advocates of the further democratization of society. Today, M. Vats writes, Uruguay is trying to strengthen the democracy that has been restored as a result of the stubborn struggle of the masses. The country is persistently looking for ways to renew itself.

The Academy of Sciences, Cuba's leading scientific institution, marked its 25th anniversary this February. V. Lunin, LATINSKAYA AMERIKA'S correspondent in Havana, asked Dr. Rosa Elena Simeon Negrin, president of the Cuban Academy of Sciences, to describe the country's scientific achievements in the past quarter century.

The period from 1960 through 1975 marked a preparatory stage in which the country's leading scientific institutions came into existence: the Academy of Sciences in 1962, the National Research Center in 1965, and the National Center for Animal Protection, which was later converted into the National Center for Animal and Plant Protection. Also, industrial and medical research institutes were set up. Scientific research was launched at universities. All of these were incorporated into a network of all kinds of research institutes and offices.

From 1975 through 1985 the number of scientific workers in Cuba almost doubled. This precipitated the need to create an agency to coordinate research efforts on a national scale. To this end, the State Committee for Science and Technology was set up in 1976. Its functions were transferred to the Cuban Academy of Sciences in 1980. A major achievement of the past 25 years was the development of the country's scientific and technological potential. More than 14,000 researchers in all fields of science were trained.

Cooperation with the USSR and other socialist community countries is of paramount importance for Cuban science. Thousands of scientific workers from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have visited Cuba, and thousands of Cuban students and specialists have been educated and trained in the socialist community countries. Tens of Cuban scientific institutions have been launched and developed with Soviet assistance.

Other articles in the issue include "On the Utilization of Marine Expanses and Resources" by V. Pisarev, "The 200-Mile Doctrine: Essence and Significance" by V. Tarasov, "Prospects for the Development of the Continental Shelf" by K. Tarasov and A. Teslenko.

8543

CSO: 1812/108

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### EDITORIAL ON 'NEW POLITICAL THINKING' IN LATIN AMERICA

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 5-6

[Editorial: "On New Political Thinking"]

[Text] The Soviet government's peaceful new foreign policy initiatives, which are wide-ranging in terms of their historical significance and extent, are receiving more and practical support across the entire planet; at the same time they are becoming a powerful international force for creating and building on the earth a world free of nuclear weapons, violence and fear of the future. In the past year, especially since the summit meeting at Reykyavik, a world without the threat of thermonuclear cataclysm, local conflicts and crises has appeared not as a mirage but as an imminent reality, one which may be filled with complex dilemmas and contradictions, but which is nonetheless aimed at preventing the accumulation and exacerbation of global problems, for walking away from the work of resolving them today because of the senseless space-weapons race will require even greater sacrifices and efforts of mankind tomorrow and will impose a very heavy burden on the generations entering the 21st century.

But a world where nations will not know the problems of hunger or the onslaught of ecological catastrophe and where the efficient use of the riches of the world ocean and outer space will resolve mankind's resource supply problem has not yet arrived. Many obstacles block the path to this world, including obstacles stemming from outdated stereotypes and approaches to world politics. Of course, one must not fail to note that in the formation of the new political thinking, which is objectively determined by mankind's arrival in the nuclear-outer space era, and by the need to work out a global vision of historical perspectives for civilization on earth, these stereotypes are being refurbished. In a world which is now rapidly changing its face, they are taking on new cosmopolitan forms which are designed to retain opportunities to decide--as before--the world's fate within narrow, unilateral interests. SDI belongs to this type of innovation.

In addition to its "outer-space" innovations, however, the White House also has other "terrestrial" innovations. They include the doctrine of so-called low-intensity conflicts, which are passed off as "liberation movements of a new kind"; they are supposedly fighting for the ideals of democracy and the strengthening of the cause of peace through the elimination of the "terrorist

threat." Its U.S. adherents include many supporters in Washington. Here they think that "low intensity"--a war fought with the latest American weapons in foreign hands: the "contras" in Nicaragua, the "death squads" in El Salvador or the so-called militarized contra support groups in Honduras and Costa Rica--will yield a great strategic effect. In this matter the vital interests and sacrifices of the peoples in the Central American countries are not taken into account. This doctrine is also dangerous because it makes solutions involving force and the escalation of conflicts more attractive within the "echelons of power." But that which they ignore in Washington has an increasingly painful effect on the fate of the Latin American peoples. They have an increasing desire to free themselves from the influence of the ideals of "democracy American style," to lay their own material foundation for the processes of genuine democratization which are taking place in the region. This can only be achieved on the path which leads to universal peace, and to the conversion of the Caribbean basin and the South Atlantic, as well as all of Latin America, into a zone of peace and cooperation.

This kind of approach is a characteristic feature of the current political development of a majority of the Latin American states. It increases the mutual attraction of all the planet's continents, on which the call for disarmament grows stronger with each passing day and important practical steps are being taken to create a firm peace on the earth, as well as the conditions to overcome the backwardness of a significant portion of mankind. Evidence of this can be seen in the visits and exchange of opinions which have taken place in the past year among representatives of the Soviet leadership and eminent political and state figures of the leading Latin American countries. The course of these meetings has demonstrated the attraction of the new political thinking and its fundamental moral superiority over the American administration's arguments in favor of the notorious SDI and the struggle against "terrorism," as it understands the word. In this way it shows that the inevitability that the new type of political thinking, which confirms the principle of nonviolence as the basis of life in the human community, will develop along an ascending curve on an international scale. The political thinking which is developing in Latin America leans increasingly toward a resolution of the problems related to overcoming backwardness and achieving genuine independence through regional unity and the formation of global peace-loving consciousness.

Undoubtedly, this is not an easy question. The problem concerns the kind of political, forcible measures and actions which can be effective, given unrelenting U.S. aggression, in other words, measures which can lead to the eradication of the social reasons which give rise to violence and the worldview tenets which justify and sometimes exalt it. The new political thinking is being formed against a background of a persistent and active search for answers to the most acute and complex questions which have been posed by history in the late 20th century. Their resolution carries within itself the dialectic of a contradictory but mutually-dependent world, of which the Latin American continent is an organic part.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

8543

CSO: 1807/207

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### ARGENTINE PRESIDENT ALFONSIN INTERVIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 7-13

[Press conference given by Argentine president Raul Alfonsin during October 1986 visit to USSR; first three paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Three years of rule by a civilian government have determined the basic reference points of the road mapped out by the ruling party of radicals to overcome the stagnation of Argentine society. These points take into account primarily the technological reconstruction which is taking place in the most developed countries of the world. In order to be included in this process the ideology of present-day Argentine radicalism declares that it is necessary to mobilize--on the basis of intensification in the country's democratization process--the efforts of the entire nation, including the business strata, which are closely associated with the multinational corporations. In the foreign policy area the doctrine of the radicals proposes a reduction in the arms race and observance of the principles of nonalignment within the framework of a "moderate line." In the foreign economic sphere it calls for adherence to Western civilization, and at the same time steps aimed at changing the financial-currency relations between the developing world and the West; it also calls for an increase in the integration processes in the southern part of the continent as a counterweight to the centers, etc.

At the same time Argentina favors the further diversification of its economic ties. The Argentine-Soviet experience of commercial cooperation provides evidence in favor of this choice. It is enough to say that in the period from 1971 through 1985 the volume of reciprocal trade increased nearly 9-fold from \$180 million to \$1.5 billion. The visit of Argentina's foreign affairs minister, D. Caputo, in January of last year provided a new impetus to the development of bilateral ties. In the course of the visit a new intergovernmental agreement was concluded on deliveries of grain and soybeans to the USSR in the 1986-1990. The development of cooperation between Soviet and Argentine firms is becoming a promising area.

The visit by R. Alfonsin in October 1986, the first official visit ever made to the USSR by an Argentine president, was an important step in strengthening relations between the two countries; it marked the start of an intensified political dialog between the Soviet Union and Argentina on bilateral relations and the current problems of world politics against the background



of the struggle for a firm peace on earth, the struggle against the risk of a nuclear catastrophe. We draw our readers' attention to the materials of a press conference held by R. Alfonsin during his visit to our country.

[Answer] I will answer all questions with pleasure but first I would like to express appreciation personally and on behalf of the Argentine delegation now in the Soviet Union for the attention and hospitality shown us by the Soviet government and, of course, by the Muscovites themselves. We very much enjoyed conversing and holding talks with the chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, with the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee and with other officials.

[Question] Mr. President, what would you say to your fellow countrymen about this visit to the Soviet Union?

[Answer] The same as I would say to everyone present here. As I have just said, this was a very important visit and, undoubtedly, a very fruitful one. It will help to strengthen and expand our ties in the most diverse spheres, including the area of trade relations and culture.

We have had an opportunity to analyze the political problems concerning the most important questions of that world in which we live. We are leaving this country, having enriched our opinion of the Soviet government after a personal meeting and conversation with one of the main participants in the talks recently held in Iceland. And, in answer to your question about what I would say to my fellow countrymen, I declare that although this visit has been very useful, I nonetheless want to be together with them.

[Question] I would like to know what the prospects are for bilateral relations, as well as what kind of joint actions are planned by Argentina and the Soviet Union in the international arena?

[Answer] We are fully satisfied with the results of our talks with members of the government of the Soviet Union; the participants in these talks included the ministers who have accompanied me, secretaries and other officials, as well as representatives of Argentina's business circles, all of whom have done a great deal to ensure the success of the visit.

It is very important that the private sector was included, that the businessmen who, as was already said, have accompanied us on our trip to the USSR, participated actively in the development of trade with the Soviet Union. We consider it essential to expand trade relations. And we are not talking just about grain. Various forms of foreign trade are already being established in the industrial sphere with the participation, of course, of national industrialists.

In order to raise bilateral trade to a new level three diverse paths are now being analyzed; first, the delivery of Soviet industrial equipment by Argentine or joint enterprises. We have a proposal concerning a plant to be constructed--with the help of private Argentine entrepreneurs and financing from the Soviet side--for the production of fertilizer using our gas and with a promise that the Soviet Union will purchase the entire output. This

example makes it possible to see that we want to move ahead in this direction. The question of pipeline sales was also put into concrete form and we assume that it will be possible to conclude a deal in the near future.

Another path involves the delivery of Argentine industrial equipment to the Soviet Union, especially in the area of agro-industrial technology. We have made progress in the negotiations, which give us grounds for firm hopes that we will be able to work together in this sphere and in the exporting of equipment to third countries.

And, finally, consideration is being given to the possibility of carrying out joint projects with financing and a guarantee by the Soviet Union of exports to third countries. This was the subject of our talks with President Gromyko, the ministers, as well as with Argentine businessmen. This subject was also discussed by both sides with the liveliest interest in this morning's conversation with General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Gorbachev.

You asked me not only about these bilateral relations but also about the development of our ties in the international sphere. In conversation with the general secretary naturally I was not able to hide our concern about the results of his meeting with President Reagan. And it is with pleasure that I want to say to you that in this regard Mr. Gorbachev encouraged me still further in the opinion that we must not talk about failure, although our hopes and the hopes of the entire world did not manage to take on concrete forms at this meeting. The meeting showed that it is possible at least to come to significant agreements. I think that the very fact of the meeting is very important and signifies a step forward.

Mr. Gorbachev said to me that he in no way considers the meeting to have been a failure. It showed that one can come to important agreements and in fact they were almost achieved. Iceland, he went on emphasize energetically, helped us to move up a step, and the Soviet side will not withdraw its proposals. This is the way. Further, he explained why all the proposals were contained in one package. In conclusion, he noted that we must continue to strengthen our common efforts and to increase them. This, in my view, is the most important aspect of our talks with the general secretary.

We also touched on other international questions which were considered by the group of nonaligned countries at their meeting in Harare, and in particular, questions related to the situation in the south of Africa, apartheid, and the need to work toward the solution of the problems in the Middle East. And, it goes without saying that during the talks which we held with Mr. Gorbachev we touched upon the general topic of Latin America, and, of course, the problem of Nicaragua.

Mr. Gorbachev stated decisively: "I want to assure you that we have no plans for military bases; we do not want to impose any system upon the people of Nicaragua, and we support the efforts of the Contadora group and the Contadora support group, of which Argentina is a part." Those were the subjects of an international nature which we touched upon in the talks with the general secretary.

[Question] There exists an idea about creating a zone of peace and cooperation in South America. What, in your opinion, needs to be done, what steps need to be taken to realize this good idea?

[Answer] We share Brazil's desire to achieve the creation of a nuclear-free zone and the final disarmament of the South Atlantic. It goes without saying that for Argentina this is very important because of the problems which Great Britain creates in not recognizing our sovereignty in the Malvinas Islands. This is one of the objectively existing obstacles. I think that at various international forums, and especially at the United Nations, these questions will be posed in such a way as to ensure that the South Atlantic zone is turned into a nuclear-free area.

[Question] Was the foreign debt problem discussed during the talks?

[Answer] The subject of the developing countries' economic problems constantly comes up at talks between various heads of states. And at this meeting, too, it could not have been otherwise. In particular, the discussion concerned the persistent need to prevent the discrimination which the developed world shows toward the developing countries in foreign trade. In this regard Mr. Gorbachev expressed the political will and resolve of the Soviet government to promote foreign trade in such a way as to prevent as far as possible those serious consequences from which we are suffering as a result of the protectionist policy of the developed countries.

[Question] In your talks did you touch on the question of possible concrete steps which Argentina could take to realize a nuclear-test ban agreement or, on the contrary, was any impossibility of achieving such an given agreement revealed? An impossibility which would mean an end to the Soviet moratorium.

[Answer] We expressed gratitude to the general secretary on behalf of the "Group of Six" for an answer to a request to stop nuclear tests by means of a moratorium, which was being carried out. We did not go more deeply into this sphere although Mr. Gorbachev acknowledged our efforts.

[Question] What are the relations between Argentina and England, is progress possible in the resolution of the Malvinas problem?

[Answer] Unfortunately, we have not been able to establish any kind of dialog on the problem of the Malvinas Islands and South Georgia in view of the negative position of the United Kingdom on this question. Since you asked me about the relations, about the state of the relations, I will say that we have had an opportunity to exchange opinions on this problem with the opposition. And from the conversations which we had in Paris and Madrid we got the clear impression that we will not resolve this problem now, immediately, but that we will find a way to resolve it, when changes take place in the political sphere in the United Kingdom.

Naturally, we think that England's actions in the Malvinas carry within themselves a threat to the security of the South Atlantic and constitute aggression against Latin America as a whole.

[Question] The system of international security proposed by the Soviet Union stipulates, in particular, a reduction in military expenditures which will help to support an increase in aid to the developing countries. What do you think about the relationship between disarmament and development?

[Answer] It is perfectly obvious that mankind is spending colossal sums on arms, of which there are enough to destroy the planet several times over. If even a portion of those resources were directed toward the fostering of the development process in the most backward countries, there would be significant progress toward the creation of a more just world. Consequently, we would, of course, welcome this.

[Question] After the summit meeting in Reykyavik, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated that all realistic forces must be active in the struggle for the survival of mankind in the nuclear age. In your view, what kind of role can Argentina, the other Latin American countries and the entire "third world" play in this?

[Answer] Argentina is a member of the "Group of Six," in which Mexico, India, Greece, Sweden and Tanzania also participate. It is fighting for a nuclear-free world, for a ban on nuclear tests and, thus for the elimination of the growing nuclear threat. I think that we can do a lot not because we have material strength, but because we have moral strength. We are in a position to convince the peoples of the planet that the arms race is leading to a catastrophe. And when public opinion in the various countries understands this, it will definitely impress its criteria upon governments, and we will be able to progress along the road to a universal peace.

[Question] Mr. President, would you express your opinion on the Soviet proposals at the Reykyavik summit?

[Answer] I think that they signify an extremely positive step forward. They were concrete and the fact that in the beginning they led to an agreement shows that the correct path was chosen.

[Question] I would like to know your opinion on what guarantees exist for the development of democracy in your country? And a second question: what kind of relations exist between Chile and Argentina?

The guarantees for the process of the development of democracy in Argentina are absolute since the people understand perfectly what the search for other alternatives means. We are perfectly confident: only democracy will enable us to utilize all opportunities for growth within the framework of freedom and respect for human dignity.

As for relations with Chile, you know that we have put an end to a centuries-old problem which we had with that country. We settled it by means of a plebiscite, in which Argentinians persistently searched for a peaceful settlement.

At the present time we are striving on the basis of the principle of non-interference and respect for the right of peoples to self-determination to

have the Chilean process develop along the path of restoring democracy and full freedom.

[Question] The situation in Central America is seen by us as exceptionally tense. There is an increase in aggressive preparations against Nicaragua. In your view, Mr. President, what are the possibilities for a normalization of the situation in Central America?

[Answer] Although the nature of the development of the situation in Central America does not arouse great optimism, it is perfectly obvious that we need to continue to make efforts aimed at preventing in every possible way those actions which are fraught with the danger that a new stage will be reached in the conflict, something which we all want to avoid.

I think that a settlement here is related to the need--and we must all understand this--to make additional efforts to resolve the region's socio-economic problems, and this, in my view, could become a principle in the search for another way out of the global Central American crisis.

[Question] I would like to know to what degree the participation of private entrepreneurs in this round of talks may influence the expansion of ties between Argentina and the Soviet Union?

[Answer] I have absolutely no doubts on this score. In the very short period which has taken place since the start of our talks a multitude of proposals which are of great mutual interest has been put forward. I am sure that many of them will be realized in the most successful manner. I think that because of the economic system in effect in Argentina the participation of the private-enterprise sector was essential in order to successfully carry out the talks not only with the Soviet state but also with autonomous enterprises. In this way they will receive through various trade deals even greater opportunities to increase their business activities which, without any doubt, will be to the benefit of both countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

CSO: 1807/207  
8543

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### URUGUAYAN TRADE UNION OFFICIALS ON UNION'S ROLE, TASKS

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 31-35

[Interview with leaders of the PIT-CNT (Interunion Plenum of Workers-National Convention of Workers) Daniel Martinez, general coordinator of the executive secretariat, and Victor Rossi, member of the executive secretariat, date and place not specified: "We Are Prepared to Defend the Rights of the Working People"]

[Text] [Question] A few words please about the traditions of the trade union movement in Uruguay.

D. Martinez: Uruguay never had what we call "yellow" trade unions. Our trade union associations have been distinguished by their willingness to fight and to defend the rights of all working people. Unity enabled us to stand firm in the difficult years of the 60's. That time was characterized by an all-out drive by the forces of monopolistic capital. In 1973 there was a coup; however, immediately after the military came to power a 15-day strike galvanized the entire country. The trade unions headed the popular resistance. Repressions began against them and people started "to disappear." Nearly all the trade union leaders and all middle-level trade union personnel were forced to leave Uruguay or to go underground. That was a great blow. The process of gathering strength was interrupted. But the dictatorship was not successful in everything: the main ingredient--the fighting mood of the working people--remained. The struggle continued underground. Our work sometimes took unexpected forms: in order to attract the masses to collective action it was sometimes necessary to start with the organization, for example, of soccer games...We had to act in different ways, but the main thing was to act! One could write books about this...

V. Rossi: Despite all the bans, the trade union movement grew and came to include thousands of new workers. Of course, a trade union, strictly speaking, cannot be underground. And with the victory of democracy we entered a broad arena. I, too, took part in the general strike of protest against the military coup and in the trade union struggle which Daniel Martinez was talking about. I was arrested in 1976 and spent six years in prison. I was 43 years old, consequently it fell to me to be one of those who passed on the

experience of struggle to the new generation. And it should be said that the young people, including Daniel Martinez (after all, he is not yet 29 years old), made an enormous contribution to the organization of resistance to the dictatorship.

To the surprise of many, the Uruguayan trade unions came out of this period stronger and more representative. We are proud of both the past and present of our trade union movement and we believe in its future.

[Question] What do the tasks of the trade unions consist of at this new stage?

V. Rossi: The trade unions played a deciding role in the unification of the forces of resistance, and this, in my opinion, also led to the democratization of the country. It was to their call that all the opposition parties and movements responded. Later the new stage began. Now it is necessary for us to achieve a restoration of the former conditions of labor and to take part in the reconstruction of the country.

The defeat of the dictatorship did not signify a fundamental social and political break. As in any other capitalist country, we face a difficult and complex struggle to improve labor legislation and to move forward in overcoming the crisis and rebuilding the entire life of the nation.

[Question] Why does your trade union center have a double name: PIT-CNT (Uruguay), what is this related to?

V. Rossi: During the dictatorship the old name, CNT (National Convention of Workers) began to signify a banned organization, which had gone underground. However, the dictatorship subsequently banned another, newly emerged organization, the Interunion Plenum of Workers (PIT). And when an end was put to the dictatorship, we decided to keep both names and unite them into one: PIT-CNT.

We have a goal--the consolidation and intensification of democracy. To the tasks of today's struggle for bread, for work for all, for better living conditions and for fairer laws, we add a demand for solutions to the long-range problems facing the country: problems of agricultural production, banks, health care, housing. We understand that the trade unions must earn the trust of the entire population, the trust not only of the working people, but also of other social strata which agree with us that the serious problems facing the country must be resolved for the good of the entire people.

At present a majority of the economically-active population, including agricultural workers, who have their own federation, are united under the aegis of the CNTU. All together, it includes more than 300,000 people, or 90 percent of the unionized workers.

Returning to the question of the tasks facing our trade union center, it should be said that we are now experiencing a process of renewal. There are many things to be done, and the most important one is to unite all the working

people. It is essential to achieve the active participation by all in the work of the primary organization and in decision making; everyone must understand the need for unity and the struggle beyond one's daily needs.

Of course, the trade unions are not a political party. We do not set ourselves the target of coming to power; we have no pretensions about ruling the country. But our platform positions show the kind of Uruguay we need--a Uruguay in which there will be no exploitation of man by man. Naturally we favor the development of the country and the protection of its sovereignty. With regard to the resolution of the foreign debt problem the trade union movement raises the issue of working out a policy which would make it possible to dispose of our resources in a sovereign manner. We are proceeding from the premise that this debt is unfair and that the people of Uruguay have not the slightest relation to it. A few numbers show why we think this way.

During the dictatorship, when Uruguay's foreign debt grew from \$700 million to \$5 billion, the foreign monopolies removed \$5 billion (according to official statistical data!) from the country. And this is not counting payments on the foreign debt. In addition, during this same period the workers lost \$6 billion due to the drop in purchasing capacity.

D. Martinez: On trips abroad we sometimes come up against colleagues who do not completely understand us: "How can it be," they say, "you fought together against the dictatorship, and now you have constant confrontations with the government? There have already been several strikes, a multitude of other conflicts has arisen...Why? How? We don't understand..." First of all, the following should be emphasized: we struggled for democracy and no one has tried harder to strengthen and intensify it. But one of the problems (and here I answer the question about the basic goals of the trade union for today) is that we, as Victor Rossi has said, want a democracy which is truly deep, the kind of democracy which would do away with the roots of the phenomena which led to the military coup of 1973. After all, no one would believe that the military coups in Uruguay, Chile, Argentina and Brazil took place because a particular faction of ambitious military men succeeded in seizing power. It is clear that the reasons for the coups have their roots in social structures, in economics and politics. On the eve of the 1973 events we lived in an atmosphere of growing authoritarianism, which reflected the desire of the ruling classes to carry out a certain economic policy being imposed by imperialism.

For many years our country, and Latin America in general, followed the economic models imposed by imperialism. The traditional systems of exploitation have become obsolete. The structural crisis "forced" the ruling circles to turn to other schemes which make it possible to sharply increase exploitation (the "Chicago School," Milton Friedman, and others). We were the first to rise up and struggle. Gradually we were joined by various strata of society, some sooner, others later, some only a few months before the fall of the dictatorship. But we all struggled for democracy, and for it to be a profound democracy. Only this kind of democracy can be stable. And in practice this means that it is necessary to change social structures, it is



necessary to change economic policy. But the present government is following the kind of economic course which is in fact a continuation of the former course. The following are characteristic of it: neoliberalism, absolute dependence on international financial capital, and full and unconditional recognition of the foreign debt payment obligations.

In 1985, for example, Uruguay earned \$700 million from exports. But the interest payments alone on the foreign debt (we are not talking about the payment of the actual debt) amounted to \$400 million. That leaves \$300 million for all import expenditures. This includes raw materials for heavy industry. And we need \$60 million for medicines alone. Under such conditions development is practically impossible. For this reason we say: "We want to defend democracy, but for this we need to change economic policy." If we continue to follow the previous economic course, then the structural factors which determined the conditions and events that led to the 1973 military coup will remain.

This explains our struggle and our opposition with regard to the government.

It is not just a matter of the crisis. There must be change in a situation in which people go to the ballot box only once every four or five years and for the rest of the time they have no way to express their opinion. Democratic forms of rule must be developed which would enable the entire people to participate in the discussion of the most important national questions, in decision making and in monitoring the implementation of those decisions.

V. Rossi: We are not putting forward any completed draft legislation, but we are putting into proposal form the basic essence of our demands. For example, we favor the nationalization of banks. Just recently a majority of the banks sold their deposits to the state and now the conditions for nationalization are being created. This would strengthen control over investment policy and would lead to the elimination of speculative activity, which is widespread in the country.

We also have proposals on other questions, specifically with regard to the development of the meat industry. Its output constitutes a significant portion of the country's exports and is an important factor in an economic upturn. However, not everything in this sector is in order: some of the slaughterhouses are standing idle, etc.

[Question] What kind of relations does the CNTU have with political organizations?

D. Martinez: Our trade union is independent. Of course, there are various ideological currents within it. That is natural, but in general it expresses an independent class position. Our relations with various political parties include cooperation with them when we want to implement some plan which is useful for the working people. Then we meet with the parliamentarians who represent the country's political parties in the Congress or Senate. The same applies in case of conflict with owners, when the participation of an intermediary is required or the intervention of the labor legislation committee is needed. These relations are permanent in nature.

V. Rossi: Of course, the trade unions have their own field of activity. The parties which traditionally form the country's government, in particular the "Colorado" Party (the current president belongs to it), are now, as before, accusing the trade unions of "leftism." In fact, the trade union movement enjoys great influence and thousands of working people actively participate in the work of trade union organizations. But at the same time a majority of them voted for Sanguinetti at the polls.

The doors of the Uruguayan trade union movement--and this is a long-standing tradition--are wide open for any working Uruguayan for the sole reason that he is a worker and not because he is affiliated with any given party. Leaders are chosen not because of party affiliation; the criteria are their level of activity, willingness to make sacrifices, personal qualities, a feeling of responsibility. As a result our leaders represent all political parties. It is true that an overwhelming majority of them belong to the Broad Front. But this is because the program of the trade unions and the platform of the Broad Front are the same in many areas.

[Question] What is your attitude toward the problem of war and peace?

V. Rossi: A feeling of international solidarity is characteristic of our working people and consequently of the trade union movement of Uruguay. In recent years we ourselves have begun to receive very broad international support. It helped us to triumph in our struggle against the dictatorship, against fascism. Our people also live with a concern for the future of other countries and peoples. At present, for example, we ache with all our soul for Nicaragua, which is threatened with aggression. We are also fully and completely on the side of the peoples of Chile and Paraguay, who are striving to overthrow the yoke of dictatorship.

And, of course, we are on the side of those who struggle for peace. For us the struggle for peace is not only a protest against the unleashing of nuclear war (although we are not indifferent to this aspect of it, as evidenced by our declarations in support of the Soviet Union's proposals), the struggle for peace is for us the creation of conditions which make it possible to put an end to dependence, to open up the road to development, to improve the people's living conditions, to reduce infant mortality and unemployment and to put an end to hunger and illiteracy.

Related to this subject are problems of social justice, which also mean for us the eradication of fascism and the expulsion of fascists from the state apparatus, where they hid after the overthrow of the dictatorship; they are a threat to the cause of democratization, and for this reason to the cause of peace as well. We think that by resolving these essential problems facing our country we are also making a contribution within our means to the common cause of the peoples of the earth in the struggle to preserve peace and to create the conditions for the development of man.

At one of the CNTU sessions the USSR's peace proposals came in for particular praise: we think that the efforts of the Soviet Union are constructive,

positive and feasible. The position of the trade union movement of Uruguay on this question coincides with the position of a majority of the Uruguayan people, including the government, which shares these concerns, something which it has stated on more than one occasion.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

8543

CSO: 1807/207

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### CREATION OF 200-MILE ZONE IN LATIN AMERICA, CARIBBEAN VIEWED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 61-66

[Article by V.B. Tarasov: "The 200-Mile Doctrine: Essence and Significance"]

[Text] The adoption by many coastal states of the doctrine declaring their right to establish jurisdiction and sovereign rights in a marine coastal zone 200 miles in width has signified the appearance of an important new element in international relations.

#### History of the Question

As is well known, the idea of creating a 200-mile zone as a first step on the path leading to the NIEO (new international economic order), belongs to the Latin Americans. As long ago as the 40's, Argentina declared its sovereign rights over the natural resources of the adjacent waters and continental shelf. On the other side of the Andes first Chile (1947) and then Peru declared sovereignty over the natural resources of a 200 mile-marine zone along their coasts. The "baton" was subsequently passed to the countries of Central America: in the late 40's and early 50's, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Honduras took similar steps.

By the end of the 60's nearly all of the Latin American coastal countries had introduced 200-mile zones, declaring them in a majority of cases to be territorial seas to which the provisions of the "Tlatelolco Treaty" apply. The development of this process contributed to the increase of interest in the joint defense and exploitation of the EEZ's (exclusive economic zones). A resolution adopted at the fourth session of the Latin American parliament in 1972 emphasized that it is impossible to achieve all-around integrated development without marine integration and maintenance of the 200-mile doctrine.

As long ago as 1952 Peru, Uruguay and Chile signed the "Santiago Declaration" concerning the marine zone after declaring exclusive sovereignty and jurisdiction over coastal waters, the seabed and mineral resources. Two years later these countries formed the Permanent Commission of the Southern Pacific (PCSP), which Colombia later joined. The activities of the PCSP on the protection of natural resources and joint use of the EEZ received support from the organs of Latin American integration. The "Antigua Declaration" was

adopted at the first conference of foreign affairs ministers of the Organization of Central American States (OCAS) in 1955; it announced the aspiration of the countries in this subregion to ensure the "joint defense of their economic and cultural heritage, including the territorial and epicontinental sea, as well as the continental shelf, the exploitation of which will benefit the peoples in these countries." [1] The development of subregional cooperation in the area of exploiting the 200-mile zone was interrupted by the war between El Salvador and Honduras in 1969. Soon after a peace treaty was signed in 1980, the foreign affairs ministers of the TSAOR (Central American Common Market) countries at a conference in San Jose expressed a desire to revive the integration process in the subregion, and the resolve to implement sovereignty over the corresponding territorial sea, the continental shelf and air space. The "San Jose Declaration" called for support to be given to any Central American country presenting substantiated claims in this area to third states. [2]

The question of creating an organization along the lines of the PCSP was also considered by the La Plata countries. In particular, Uruguay twice, in 1976 and 1977, put forward its own plan, calling for the joint defense of the 200-mile zones and the expansion of cooperation among the countries of this subregion to develop these zones.

In 1978 Brazil, Venezuela, Bolivia, Guyana, Colombia, Peru, Surinam and Ecuador created a new integration organ on the basis of the Treaty on Amazon Cooperation; questions of river and maritime navigation directly affecting the 200-mile limit lie within its area of competence. At the same time one cannot say that the process of introducing the 200-mile zones has proceeded smoothly. As long ago as 1970 certain disagreements emerged at a regional conference on the law of the sea held in Lima. In particular, the Caribbean countries objected categorically to the declaration of EEZ's, considering that this would lead to conflicts between neighboring states. It is no accident that the final declaration recommended that "reasonable criteria" should be used in the resolution of this question. [3] The Caribbean states found acceptable a version of the 200-mile zone under the status of patrimonial sea; territorial waters up to 12 miles wide are declared within its limits, while in the remaining part sovereign rights are declared over the resources without hindrance to the freedom of navigation and flights for third countries. This interpretation of the 200-mile zone found its reflection in the "Santo Domingo Declaration," adopted by the Caribbean countries in 1982.

The conflicts caused by the introduction of the 200-mile zone include the argument among Nicaragua, El Salvador and Honduras over the Gulf of Fonseca, between Nicaragua and Colombia over the islands of San Andres and Kinta, etc. Venezuela's and Colombia's claims to the oil-bearing seabed and the islands of the Gulf of Venezuela should also be included here. This long-standing conflict, despite an agreement signed in 1976 concerning demarcation, threatened to drag on for a long time, influencing the activities of the Andes group as a whole. It was settled only after a number of bilateral agreements on boundary integration were signed.

In 1984, with Vatican mediation, Argentina and Chile signed a treaty, which put an end to a dispute going back more than 100 years over possession of the

southern regions near the Antarctic. Three small islands in the eastern sector of Beagle Sound--Nueva, Lennox and Picton--went to Chile, which was given an opportunity to establish a 200-mile zone, including a significant area of the oil-bearing continental shelf and of the Antarctic sector. According to the treaty, Chile established 3-mile territorial waters, followed by an EEZ, divided by a broken line into Argentine and Chilean parts. In the treaty this region was named the sea of the southern zone. Chile was permitted to include in its own EEZ marine expanses to the south of the dividing line, running from Cape Horn in the west to the "boundary of the open sea." With regard to third countries, Argentina and Chile reserved for themselves the right to declare "a territorial sea of the maximum width permitted by international law." [4] The signing of the treaty was a direct consequence of the military conflict between Argentina and England over the Malvinas, which from the viewpoint of international law, could have been called a "battle for the 200-mile zone." Closely related to this is the military aspect of Latin American integration in the area of the law of the sea. For example, in 1966 Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Paraguay formed a general Command of the Southern Zone of the Atlantic (COMAS), which united the naval forces of these countries. Argentine and Brazilian admirals take turns leading it (for two-year terms). In addition, beginning in the 70's, the Argentine and Brazilian navies have regularly held joint maneuvers in the South Atlantic. To a certain measure they are a reaction to the aggressive actions of imperialism off the coast of Argentina. The agreement on the South Atlantic, which was signed by Argentina and Brazil on the eve of the Malvinas conflict, is significant from this viewpoint. The agreement contained an expression of the desire to rid this zone of international tension and confrontation. [5]

While developing this kind of approach, the civilian governments in Argentina and Brazil came to understand the need to search in other directions for a resolution of the Malvinas crisis. In 1986 at the 41st UN General Assembly, an overwhelming majority of the delegates approved Brazil's proposal 1) to declare the South Atlantic a zone of peace and cooperation, 2) to reduce and eventually to eliminate a military presence there and 3) to ensure that nuclear weapons and other forms of weapons of mass destruction are not placed there.

The region's states are increasing the struggle to turn Central America and the Caribbean basin into a zone of peace.

#### The U.S. Position

The United States took advantage of the Second World War to establish military control of the waters of the Western hemisphere. According to Article 4 of the "Inter-American Mutual Defense Treaty" (IAMDT) adopted in 1947, the waters extending 400 miles from the shore line around the American continent, including Greenland, were declared to be a "security zone," the violation of which could entail collective or individual sanctions. Somewhat earlier, in 1945, the USA unilaterally extended its control and jurisdiction over the resources of the continental shelf and arbitrarily introduced along its coast lines fishing zones which were closed to other countries. Washington's

practices have included the declaration of a blockade in the coastal waters of Guatemala in 1954 and around Cuba during the "Caribbean crisis" of 1962.

The announcement of the 200-mile zones by the Latin American countries aroused a painful reaction from the USA, which tried to hinder the extension of this phenomenon (undesirable to the USA) by means of the organs of "inter-American system," and especially through the Inter American Legal Committee (IALC). After the USA had taken advantage of the tense situation around the Dominican Republic, the U.S. delegation at a 1965 IALC meeting managed to include in the final resolution a proposal to limit the territorial waters of the region's countries to 12 miles. This was a direct attack against the supporters of the EEZ's, but also the last U.S. success in the struggle to turn back the process by which the coastal states are extending their sovereignty to the adjacent waters.

The confrontation between the Latin American "Club of 200-Mile Countries" and the Washington administration intensified. The latter was forced to pay increasing fines for illegal fishing in sovereign zones. In 1969 the American Congress adopted the "Pelly amendment," which gives the president the right to cut off military assistance to a country detaining fishing vessels in waters which Washington considers to be international. The PCSP (Permanent Commission of the Southern Pacific) announced a protest supported by the Latin American parliament and other organs of regional integration. At a conference held in 1969 in Buenos Aires on questions of fishing, the Latin American countries rejected a U.S. proposal to form an inter-American institute on law of the sea issues as an organ of arbitration; also rejected was a U.S. proposal to conclude the kind of convention on coastal waters which in general would not contain any provisions about the 200-mile zone.

In 1971 at the request of one of the PCSP members, an emergency conference was called for states which were part of the "inter-American system" to settle the sharp disagreements on these issues between the USA and its "junior partners." The resolution approved by the majority of Latin American countries ignored the American viewpoint for the first time in the history of the "inter-American system." The meeting called for "abstaining from the use of any means which could affect the sovereignty of the states and the tranquility in the hemisphere." [6]

Under pressure from the region's states, the United States retreated in the early 70's from its position of not accepting Latin America's sovereign rights to the 200-mile zones. [7] The Latin American majority also came out in favor of limiting the inter-American "security zone." At an advisory conference of IAMDT participants in San Jose (1975) a supplementary protocol to the treaty was adopted; it introduced a provision on the reduction of this zone from 400 to 200 miles off the coast. [8] This step provided evidence that the region's countries, in contrast with the USA, interpret the role of their 200-mile zones more broadly, entrusting them not only with economic but also with defense functions.

It is on precisely this question that a new set of conflicts has emerged. In their efforts to achieve recognition of both the economic as well as the strategic status of their coastal expanses, the Latin American states as long

ago as 1973 at a session of the IALC, managed to include in the final resolution a demand that strategic weapons not be located on the seabed or ocean floor in the respective zones. In 1979, at the request of President Carter, an inter-departmental report was prepared in which it was proposed "to demonstrate the American flag" at a distance of up to three miles from the shore line of those foreign states which "lay claim to territorial waters of greater width." [9] The Latin American coastal states, having declared their 200-mile zones to be territorial seas, interpreted Washington's position as a direct challenge to their security. In a note from the PCSP it was pointed out that "responsibility for the possible violation of the rights of other states will lie with those who try to ignore the fact of the zone's existence." [10]

In 1982 not only Argentina, but all of Latin America became convinced of what the U.S. attempts to "squeeze" the 200-mile doctrine (which it recognized formally) into the framework of the "inter-American system" were worth. In 1947 Argentina had insisted that the Malvinas Islands be included in the sphere of the IAMDT, counting on the USA and the "inter-American system" to provide the assistance stipulated in the treaty in the event of outside aggression. However, as is well known, Washington not only made a choice in favor of its NATO ally but also blocked Argentina's appeal to the OAS Council for assistance, in essence giving its blessing to the efforts to undermine the status of Argentine coastal waters and to Great Britain's illegal declaration of a 200-mile military zone in the inter-American "security zone." The subsequent U.S. armed intervention in Grenada and the subversive actions in Central America, specifically the violation of the status of the coastal waters of Nicaragua, only accelerated the crisis of the "inter-American system."

The desire of the Southern cone states to provide for the security of their 200-mile zones through their own means, relying on joint naval formations of the "Fraternidad" type rather than on the IAMDT, arouses particular concern in Washington. [11]

The consequences of the evolution of the "inter-American system," including consequences in the area of providing marine security for the Latin American countries, are analyzed in a report prepared for the U.S. administration by the Center for the Study of International Problems headed by the prominent American expert on inter-American relations, S. Linowitz. The authors of the report recognize that after the Malvinas crisis the Latin Americans lost hope that the "inter-American system" could ensure their security, and now they are counting on their own forces. Further, there follows the conclusion that the system should be strengthened by attracting for this purpose the existing integration mechanisms, including those in the marine sphere. It is recommended that in the Caribbean basin there should be a general rejection of the 200-mile zones, and "by following the traditions of integration among the political units of the region," adhere to a certain general set of conditions. [12]

Practical steps to turn the integration units of the Caribbean and Central American countries into appendages of the "inter-American system" have already been taken: the creation of "regional security forces," trained and supplied



by the United States under the banner of Caribbean integration; militarization of the Central American subregion with the aid of the TSASO (Central American Defense Council), including the coastal waters of Nicaragua and other countries; Reagan's so-called Caribbean initiative--all this follows the goal of directing the integration processes into the channel of the "inter-American system."

#### The Test of Time

As a result of the demands to accelerate socio-economic development and to ensure security in the face of international imperialism, the 200-mile zones, like other functional substructures of integration which have been formed on the Latin American periphery of the world capitalist economy, have spread throughout the world.

The UN, its specialized organs, and the nonaligned movement have played a large role in this. Following the decision of the General Assembly to hold the 3d International Conference on the Law of the Sea (CLS) in Montivideo in the early 70's, a special committee was formed which sent a delegation to the 12th Conference of the Afro-Asian Advisory Committee on Law of the Sea Issues (Colombo, 1970). The conference participants approved in principle the right of coastal states to declare 200-mile economic zones off their shores. This was also discussed at the African Regional Seminar on the Law of the Sea (Yaunde, 1972). The decision of the coastal countries of this region to declare 200-mile economic zones was subsequently included in the "Addis Ababa Declaration," adopted by the (OAU) Organization of African Unity.

Before the beginning of the organized session of the 3d CLS in 1973, more than 100 out of 150 countries represented at the conference were prepared in principle to support the idea of the 200-mile zone. At the first working session Latin America proposed approval of the 200-mile zone in the "Santo Domingo version": 12 miles of territorial sea plus 188 miles of the EEZ, within which limits a coastal state carries out its own sovereign economic rights without hindrance to freedom of flight, navigation, or the laying of cable and pipelines by other countries.

In 1982, after nearly 10 years of intense work, the overwhelming majority of the 150 states represented at the Conference adopted the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, the fifth section of which is wholly devoted to the right of the coastal states to introduce EEZ's off their shores. However, a number of Latin American coastal states, having declared 200-mile territorial waters, took a separate position and Ecuador in general refused to sign the Convention. During the work of the conference the EEC and somewhat earlier the OAU announced the introduction of EEZ's (with the exception of the Mediterranean Sea). The introduction of such zones off the shores of a number of Asian countries united in ASEAN and the South Pacific Forum, was no less significant.

The results of the 3d CLS were exceptionally great because the implementation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea makes it possible to create nuclear-free zones over a significant area of the globe. The declaration of the EEZ's as nuclear-free zones runs counter to the aggressive policy of the

Washington administration, which judges such measures to be a direct threat to its global strategy. President Reagan stated that the USA will respect the economic zones only if they take account of freedom of action for the USA, by which one should clearly understand freedom of movement for the IMF [sic; possibly source misprint for "navy"] and strategic aviation, which is, in the opinion of the administration, a "substantial condition for the maintenance of peace."

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries take a fundamentally different approach: they favor universal and complete disarmament, and the inclusion of the planet's oceanic expanses in the general process of creating an all-encompassing system of international security and cooperation.

The development of the process of introducing 200-mile zones and the growing significance of the latter in the struggle for the NIEO, as well as in the reduction of the threat to the general peace, provide evidence that the Latin American 200-mile doctrine has not only withstood the test of time successfully but also has turned into an important component of today's international relations.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "The Changing Law of the Sea." Leiden, 1974, p 109.
2. COMERCIO EXTERIOR. Mexico, No 10, 1980, p 1141.
3. National Legislation and Treaties Relating to the Law of the Sea. pp 586-587.
4. For more detail see CLARINA. Buenos Aires, 20 October; 5 November; 28 December 1984.
5. ESTRATEGIA. Buenos Aires, No 70, 1982, p 82.
6. EXCELSIOR. Mexico, 31 January 1971.
7. For more detail see: Doc. OEA/Ser.9/Cp/doc.214/72 rev.1, 20 septiembre de 1972, pp 14-18; "Realities of the Western hemisphere." Washington, 1973, p 3.
8. AMERICAS. Washington, No 9, 1975, pp 43-44.
9. THE NEW YORK TIMES, 12 August 1979.
10. MERCURIO. Santiago de Chile 25 August 1979.
11. AFERS INTERNACIONALS. Barcelona, No 5, 1984, p 58.
12. For more detail see: "The Americas at Crossroads." Washington, 1983, p 55.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987  
8543  
CSO: 1807/207

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### LATIN AMERICAN CONTINENTAL SHELF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT NOTED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 66-75

[Article by K. S. Tarasov and A. Yu. Teslenko: "Prospects for the Development of the Continental Shelf"]

[Excerpts] The continental shelf of Latin America and the adjacent waters of the World Ocean occupy an enormous area. In recent years the Latin American countries have shown increased interest in the comprehensive development of their incalculable natural wealth, especially their mineral and biological wealth. This interest is prompted by the gradual exhaustion of the dry-land reserves of certain types of nonrenewable fuel and raw-material resources, by the shortage of food and by a number of other factors, especially progress in science and technology, which provide the opportunity to bring these resources into economic circulation at an accelerated rate.

The Mining Industry. At the present time the marine extraction of mineral raw materials plays a growing role in the Latin American mining industry. Petroleum occupies a leading place among the useful mineral resources extracted from the ocean floor. Let us recall that the first oil wells were drilled in the waters of this region in 1923 (laguna Maracaibo, Venezuela). After 1949, when the first stationary marine platforms appeared, subsequently followed by floating platforms, the prospecting and production of petroleum in this way began to pick up speed. In the early 80's, off-shore production in the capitalist world accounted for 32 percent of the total volume, and in the Latin American countries it accounted for 39 percent. In 1981 this region was second only to the countries of the Near East and Middle East in terms of the quantities produced at off-shore sites (121 million tons in comparison with 237 million tons) [1]

Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, Chile and Trinidad and Tobago are the leading off-shore oil producers. The significance of this industry is increasing in Peru and Ecuador. In Argentina, the Dominican Republic and Colombia are carrying out intensive preparatory work on the prospecting of deposits and the development of off-shore production. Brazil, Mexico and Chile have set up the production of marine platforms which require, as is well known, special technical knowledge and complex equipment. According to predictions, by the year 2000 the production of shelf petroleum in the region will reach 240-275 million tons, including 150-160 million tons in Mexico, 50-60 million tons in

Venezuela, 30-40 million tons in Brazil and 10-15 million tons in other countries. The penetration of the region's oil industry by the MNC's (multinational corporations) is increasing. At the present time foreign--especially American--companies, are carrying out prospecting work on the continental shelf of nearly all the coastal countries.

Mexico. The main industry is concentrated in the Gulf of Mexico, and especially in the Bay of Campeche. It is here, in the opinion of experts, that one of the largest petroleum bearing basins in the world is located. Prospecting work in this zone was started in 1972; the first operating well was drilled three years later, and the industrial production of oil and gas began in 1978. In the early 80's three-fifths of all Mexican petroleum was produced here. [2] The bay is relatively shallow, and this facilitates large-scale production.

Several years later another deposit site was discovered in the northern part of the Gulf of California: this gave rise to hopes that oil production along the Western coast of Mexico could be become a reality.

Venezuela. The deposits in the Maracaibo zone have been exploited for about 60 years already; they account for 80 percent of the country's total oil production. In the 70's proven oil reserves hardly increased at all, which stimulated the search and industrial development of continental shelf formations. The state company "Petroven" played a large role in the organization of the work. In 1977 it adopted a 15-year plan. It called for the search to be extended to the entire shelf zone (from the Gulf of Venezuelan in the west to the mouth of the Amacuro river in the east). Three companies which are part of "Petroven" ("Lagoven, Maroven" and "Corpoven") are participating in the implementation of the plan. Coordination of the work has been assigned to the French firm "Elf Aquitaine" which has a great deal of experience in prospecting off-shore oil and gas deposits.

In the late 70's and early 80's the French specialists studied the geological structures of the country's continental shelf in the Caribbean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean and in the mouth of the Orinoco River. According to the firm's estimates, the total natural-gas reserves on the shelf amount to 230-280 billion cubic meters. The industrial development of the deposits, including the construction of underwater pipelines, will require a capital investment of \$2.2 billion. [3] At the present time propsecting work is being carried out on virtually the entire continental shelf, but most actively in the Bay of Paria. Another \$3 billion is to be spent on these purposes.

Brazil. This country produces less off-shore oil than Mexico and Venezuela. However, the significance of this industry is constantly growing because the Brazilian economy depends directly on imported fuel, for which enormous amounts are spent.

Prospecting work on the shelf began in the second half of the 60's. In 1968 the first off-shore oil deposits (Guarisema) were discovered off the coast of the state of Sergipe, and in 1969 the first gas deposits (Caioba) were discovered here. In the 70's a number of small oil deposits were discovered.

The 1974 discovery of the Campus marine oil basin, off the shores of Rio de Janeiro, was a major success; subsequently it became the country's leading oil field. Oil prospecting on the shelf swallows up nearly 90 percent of all appropriations for petroleum prospecting work. In terms of the number of active off-shore oil platforms Brazil was among the top five countries in 1979. The Brazilian special fleet for underwater drilling is exceeded only the U.S. fleet in terms of number of vessels. Plans called for 100 off-shore wells to be drilled every year in the early 80's but in reality this level was exceeded on average by 50 percent (for 1982-1985). [4] As a result of intensive prospecting work on the shelf, it was established as early as 1980 that reserves of off-shore oil exceed the reserves on dry land.

Deposits on the continental shelf of the states of Rio de Janeiro, Espirito Santo and Bahia are being actively worked. In 1984 the average daily production in these regions amounted to two-thirds of all production. The major oil fields in the Campus basin have 53 operating off-shore platforms, built largely with their own resources. Oil is being extracted at a depth of 115 to 145 meters. The oil and the casing head gas are transported to shore through a system of underwater pipelines with a total length of more than 500 kilometers. It is expected that in 1987 the total capital investment in the development of the basin will reach \$5.5 billion, of which \$4.5 billion will be spent on developing and starting up exploitation of new deposits. In 1985 the state oil company "Petrobraz" announced the discovery of very large oil deposits in this region; they will make it possible to increase production approximately 3-fold. [5]

In Chile the extraction of hydrocarbons is concentrated in the extreme south of the country, in the province of Magallanes. The working of the deposits is being carried out by the state company ENAP. In the fall of 1976 the first drilling platform went into operation in the Strait of Magallanes. By 1980 off-shore deposits had begun to play a leading role: their proportion of total production amounted to 75 percent. In 1982 the Pinochet junta reduced financing for the work, after setting out new conditions for the operation of foreign companies wishing to obtain concessions for prospecting and producing oil on the continental shelf. [6]

Trinidad and Tobago are also among the countries extracting energy resources from the shelf. Production on the island of Trinidad began even before the First World War. By the beginning of the 60's the dry-land deposits were largely exhausted, and the center of gravity gradually shifted to the exploitation of off-shore deposits.

In Peru, shelf production began to be developed in the early 70's, when reserves of dry-land deposits in the region of the city of Talar ran out. The production volume is still not great (no more than 20 percent of the total volume for the country); the state company "Petroperu" is devoting most of its attention to the development of the oil industry in the rain forest. Nonetheless, active prospecting on the shelf is being carried out along the entire coast--from the border with Ecuador to the city of Pisco.

As of now Argentina has not produced off-shore oil; however, in the opinion of many experts and specialists, its continental shelf, with an area of 800,000

square kilometers, has very rich reserves of this raw material. U.S. experts, who studied this zone in 1975, judged its petroleum potential (including the Malvinas Islands) to be in the range of 5.7--28.3 billion tons.

In the 60's and 70's, 33 test wells were drilled off the southern coast of the province of Buenos Aires and in the Gulf of San Jorge; however, they did not yield oil, and consequently operations were suspended. The search was renewed only after the April 1978 adoption of the law decree No 21778, which defined the conditions for "risk contracts" for foreign oil companies. It should be noted that although prospecting increased significantly after the law-decree went into effect, there were no tangible results. In 1985-1986 a group of multinationals (including Exxon, Texaco, Amoco and others) expressed its willingness to begin drilling new wells in the region of Rawson. [7]

As for other countries of Latin America, the most promising from the viewpoint of the development of energy resources, is thought to be the continental shelf of Colombia, Ecuador and certain Caribbean states (especially Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, the Bahamian islands and Surinam).

**Solid Minerals.** Underwater mining of these deposits plays an insignificant role; in terms of volume it is many times less than the production of shelf oil and gas.

The existing appraisals of the potential and proven reserves of solid minerals on the shelf are extremely approximate and conflicting, which is explained by the fact that the geological structures of the continent have not been well-studied. The production of building materials--sand, gravel, limestone and crag are the most common; as a rule these materials are used on site.

The production of chemical products from sea water is only marginally developed, with the exception of the production of cooking salt by evaporation. For example, at the marine salt works in Arauja and Coche (Venezuela) the production volume amounts to 160,000 and 180,000 tons per year respectively. The extraction of magnesium from sea water has been started in Mexico. Argentina intends to build Latin America's first enterprise to produce bromine.

Although the continent has vast waterless and arid exapnses, the desalination of sea water has not been developed as of now. At the present time the region has a total of five desalination installations, of which two are located in Venezuela, two in the Netherlands Antilles (the waterless islands of Aruba and Curacao) and one in Chile.

In many countries one can observe a growing interest in the utilization of energy from oceanic tides and the construction of major tidal power stations. On the oceanic shores of Latin America the waves associated with the incoming and outgoing tides are of great amplitude, reaching 8-10 and even 13 meters. However, at present only Argentina has demonstrated interest in building stations of this type. It has commissioned French firms to work out a plan for a tidal electric power station with a capacity of 10 million kilowatts in the Gulf of San Jorge.

Bioresources (sea products). In the 50's and 60's the rate of growth in the production and utilization of bioresources, mainly anchovies, in the Latin American countries was the highest in the world. By the end of the 60's the production of sea products in comparison with the pre-war period had increased here 50-fold and reached 14-15 million tons per year (of which Peru accounted for 10-11 million tons), while the region's share in the worldwide total production reached 20-25 percent.

The intensive fishing of anchovies during this period allowed Peru to become the world's number one user of bioresources, surpassing Japan. [8] Soon afterwards the reserves became sharply depleted due to the rapacious fishing, and this affected the total volume of marine products derived by the region as a whole. In the late 70's and early 80's there was a new upturn, mainly due to growth in the catches of Peru and especially Chile.

At the present time 8-9 million tons of marine products are landed in Latin American annually. About 75 percent of the catch is used for fish meal. The basic producers are Chile, Peru, Mexico, Brazil, Ecuador and Argentina. Out of 32 coastal and island states which are engaged in fishing, 19 catch 10,000 tons a year or less and the rest catch on the order of 20,000 tons. [9] Mexico has the largest catch of food fish in the region; it has worked out a consistent program for the development of fishing, which is a component of the program adopted in 1980 to provide the country's population with food.

Fish Catch in a Number of Latin American Countries  
in the Years 1960-1983, in thousands of tons [10]

Countries	1960	1970	1980	1983
Chile	340	1179	2817	4168
Peru	3569	12613	2731	1487
Mexico	198	357	1244	1070
Brazil	251	515	820	844
Argentina	105	215	384	---

The export of fishing output grew 4-fold in 10 years and reached nearly \$2 billion in 1980, of which shrimp accounted for \$0.9 billion. Nonetheless, the region's share of world exports of marine products fell to 13 percent in comparison with 17.6 percent in 1970; this included shrimps, which fell from 26 to 22 percent. In general, however, the region's countries do not fully utilize the industry's export potential. An improvement in the export structure (in particular, an increase in the proportion of high added value, for example, canned fish) could yield a substantial increase in export earnings.

Chile's coastal area extends for more than 4,000 square kilometers; its territorial waters are rich in various types of marine products. In the 60's and early 70's their production fluctuated within a range of 0.6 to 1.5 million tons per year. Upon coming to power, the military junta adopted a

course of uncontrolled exploitation of the country's natural resources, specifically its marine bioresources. The main thrust was put on catching non-food fish for processing into fishmeal, which is an export commodity. In 1980 Chile became the world's number one producer of fishmeal, and in 1983 it was number three in the harvesting of marine products. As for food fish, its consumption remains at a low level: 4.5 kg per person per year.

The junta continued to sell off the country's national resources: for a small fee (\$1,000 from a ship and \$20 for every ton of fish caught) it granted foreign fleets the right to harvest marine products within Chile's 200-mile zone. This is leading to a gradual exhaustion of bioresources: in 1984 the catch of marine products in the country fell 18 percent and amounted to 3.4 million tons. [11]

For a long time the oceanic waters of Peru have attracted the attention of scientists, especially geographers, oceanologists and ichthyologists. The abundance of fish in the region of the continental shelf results from the presence of various oceanic currents and a favorable combination of air and water temperatures, which contributes to an accelerated process of photosynthesis in the oceanic waters and consequently to the formation of enormous masses of phyto- and zooplankton, which are the basic food for fish.

Mexico is in third place after Chile and Peru in terms of the scale on which marine products are harvested. In the mid-70's the National Fisheries Board and the state company "Productos pesceros mexicanos," were established; the latter became one of the largest companies of its kind in Latin America. Measures were taken to upgrade the fishing fleet, to organize new fishing cooperatives and strengthen the material base of existing ones, to improve the purchasing system, and to structurally re-organize the mechanism for the management of the industry. [13] All this made it possible to improve the population's food supply and to diversify exports. A constraining factor is its orientation toward the USA (that country accounts for about 90 percent of the marine products which are exported), which dictates its own conditions. The steps taken in recent years to diversify exports have not yet yielded tangible results, with the exception of some increase in the delivery of fish commodities to Japan.

The great extent of its sea coast (8,000 kilometers), the enormous area of its territorial waters (2.7 million square kilometers) and its major reserves of bioresources make it possible for Brazil to organize large-scale harvesting of marine products. However, until recently fishing lagged behind significantly in this country. A purposeful financial policy and the introduction of a number of benefits for fishermen contributed to growth in the catch from 340,000 tons in 1970 to 650,000 tons in 1982 (about 1 percent of world production). [14] Nonetheless, small-scale fishing, which employs 380,000 people, even now accounts for about 50 percent of the catch. [15]

According to the latest FAO estimates, the volume of biomass in Argentina's 200-mile economic zone (an area of about 1 million square kilometers) amounts to 10 million tons, and 2.7 million tons is the maximum possible catch which can be made without jeopardizing reproduction. The actual harvesting of marine products usually does not exceed 300,00 to 350,000 tons per year and



only in certain years does it reach 500,000 to 550,000 tons. Hake, cod, anchovies and "dorada" constitute the bulk of the fish which are taken, and other types of marine products include squid. The main harvesting region is the marine zone of the province of Buenos Aires; its share of the general catch goes as high as 85-90 percent.

Ecuador stands out among the other Latin American countries in terms of its level of fishing. In the second half of the 70's alone its harvest of marine products grew 3-fold and reached 670,000 tons (1980). The industry is being developed along Peruvian and Chilean lines, with an orientation toward the export of fishmeal, tuna and shrimps. It is enough to note that shrimp export alone grew from \$2 million in 1970 to \$80 million in 1982, with a total volume of marine-product exports amounting to \$211 million. [17]

Fishing is developing at a rapid rate in Uruguay: the catch increased from 16,000 tons in 1974 to 120,000 in 1980. This rapid development is the result of the transition of the industry to industrial methods of fishing with the application of recently-purchased modern fishing vessels, especially freezer trawlers. [18]

Practically all the island countries of the Caribbean have great opportunities for the development of fishing: their coastal waters are rich in various species of fish and shellfish. However, in these countries, excluding Cuba, the scale of the catch does not exceed 10,000 tons per year, and the fishing is carried out by extremely primitive means.

It is obvious that there are significant reserves for the development of the resources of the continental shelf. It is possible that in the future the region will see the establishment of a large off-shore mining industry, while an increase in the output of seafood products and the development of aquaculture create conditions to ease the food problem, which is acute today in a number of Latin American countries. However, the scale on which the shelf resources are utilized depends on the resolution of extremely complex questions of international law, concerning first of all the boundaries of the economic zones. The contradictions which exist in this area contribute to a tense situation in the region and lie at the heart of many arguments and conflicts between the Latin American countries.

The prospects for the mining of mineral resources on the continental shelf are also related to ecological factors. It is essential to introduce non-polluting waste-free technologies on a broader scale, as well as reliable systems for monitoring the observance of the respective international rules and norms. However, given the complex economic situation in the region's countries, it seems unlikely that these questions will be resolved in the immediate future.

In many countries the rate of growth in food production falls short of demand (if it is not actually dropping). This relative reduction could be made up through seafood products. However, a majority of the region's countries, among them Brazil, Venezuela and Colombia, have not been able to take advantage to the necessary degree of the preferential right to fish in their own 200-mile zones. It can be said that the establishment of such zones has

greater significance in international law than actual economic significance and does not exert a substantial influence on the dynamics of harvesting marine products.

It is paradoxical that the Latin American countries, which are experiencing a shortage of certain animal proteins, are even now exporting nearly all of their output from fishing. In Argentina fish provide 1 percent of the protein consumed, they provide 1.2 percent in Uruguay, 2.2 percent in Colombia and Ecuador and 3.3 percent in Brazil. [19] But the potential of the continental shelf makes it possible to bring the region's catch of seafood products up to 25-32 million tons and fully eliminate the protein deficit. Of course, one must not fail to consider that the biological productivity of the shelf is not the same in all places. The lowest indicators are characteristic of the tropical waters of Colombia, Venezuela and Brazil, and this naturally slows up the development of the industry. Moreover, it is obvious that the fishing fleet must be modernized in order to expand the geography of the fishing. Even now most types of seafood are caught with the help of small old vessels. Only Peru, Chile and Mexico have relatively modern fleets. The region's countries have a shortage of specialists and financial resources for scientific-research projects in this industry.

A separate question is the effectiveness of bioresource utilization: for example, in shrimp fishing for every ton of the desired product usually 5-10 tons of fish are caught, and in a majority of cases this fish is thrown overboard. In the opinion of specialists, the use of even half of this "undesirable" catch would make it possible to sharply increase fish consumption in the region.

As a result of the worsening food problem in a number of countries, there has recently been increased interest in oceanic research, and in bioresources in particular. The tonnage of the specialized fleet has increased significantly, which has made it possible to carry out a number of important programs in the area of scientific research support for fishing. Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Peru and Venezuela are the most active in this regard.

However, it should be emphasized that that scale of fishing throughout the region is already quite large; the shortage of marine products is the result of the massive processing of food species of fish for commercial output (primarily fishmeal), as well as the growing exports of the most valuable types of seafood (tuna, shellfish and others) to the developed capitalist countries.

Shifting the emphasis to domestic consumption and saturating the market with the cheaper species of fish could lessen the acuteness of the food problem to a certain degree. However, this requires a fundamental restructuring of the industry's material base and of the entire system of organization for the sale of output. It is indicative that of late there has been increased cooperation among the Latin American countries in the training of personnel for the industry. The impulse for this was provided by the July 1982 establishment of the Latin American Organization for the Development of Fishing with headquarters in Lima.

The numerous problems on the road to the development of the resources of the continental shelf are compounded by the obstructionist policy of the MNC's, which are trying to prevent the Latin American countries from disposing of the shelf resources independently, especially strategic resources. The battle for the continental shelf still lies ahead. It is important that for the region's states to be fully aware of the significance of the shelf in the subsequent struggle for economic independence.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. ANNALES DES MINES. Paris, No 11-12, 1982, pp 125-126.
2. OFFSHORE. London, No 7, 1983, pp 90-91.
3. PETROLEUM INTERNATIONAL. Tulsa. No 5, 1982, pp 39-40.
4. PETROLE ET ENTERPRISE. Paris, No 20, 1985, p 30.
5. QUARTERLY ENERGY REVIEW. "Latin America and the Caribbean." London, No 1, 1986, pp 24-25.
6. PETROLEUM ECONOMIST. London, No 6, 1982, pp 227-228.
7. QUARTERLY ENERGY REVIEW. "Latin America and the Caribbean." No 1, 1986, p 17.
8. By the end of the 60's this product accounted for about 20 percent of the world wide industry. It is used mainly for the production of fishmeal.
9. "U.N. Statistical Yearbook 1981." New York, 1983, pp 557-560.
10. "Latinskaya Amerika v tsifrakh" [Latin America in Figures]. Moscow, 1979, p 1122; "LA PECHE MARITIME. Paris, No 1274, 1984, p 260; No 1288-1289, 1985, p 484.
11. FRANCE PECHE. Paris, No 300, 1985, p 10.
13. ROTACION. Madrid, No 154, 1981, pp 24, 25.
14. BULLETIN DE ASSOCIATION GEOGRAPHES FRANCAISES. Paris, No 502-503, 1984, p 177.
15. AGRICULTURA. Madrid, No 622, 1984, p 618.
17. INDUSTRIES ET TRAVAUX D'OUTRE-MER. Paris, No 355, 1983, p 362.
18. FISHING NEWS INTERNATIONAL. London, No 1, 1980, pp 13, 14.
19. MARINE FISHING REVIEW. No 7-8, 1980, p 12.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987  
8543

CSO: 1807/207

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### DEMOGRAPHIC ENCYCLOPEDIA DICTONARY PUBLISHED

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 p 141

[Review by A.P. Alekseyev of book "Demograficheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar" [An Encyclopedic Demographic Dictionary]. Moscow, "Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya", 1985, 607 pages]

[Text] After much effort extending over a period of many years, Soviet scholars have succeeded in filling a vacuum which previously existed in various areas of demographic science. Written in simple and clear language, the "Dictionary" is accessible to a broad range of readers, while specialists in the social scientists have finally received in concentrated form a voluminous digest of demographic knowledge. The "Dictionary" includes more than 1,600 articles; it is successfully illustrated and supplied with charts, maps and drawings. At the end of the book there are 17 appendices, a list of the main abbreviations and a name index.

The well-thought out structure of the work has made it possible to encompass specific features not only of the general but also of the regional demographic development of the world, and of Latin America in particular. An analysis of the material devoted to that continent's demographic development provides evidence of how the "Dictionary" substantially supplements the "Latinskaya Amerika" [Latin America] encyclopedia. The problems of the region's population are reflected in a whole series of general articles such as "Global Population Problems," "Demographic History," "The Family," "Population Migration," "Urbanization," "The UN," "The Demographic Explosion," "Censuses" and others.

It is likely that for the Latin American specialist the most valuable materials will prove to be those on the real processes of population reproduction in every specific country of Latin America, including not only the major ones such as Brazil, Mexico, Colombia or Argentina but also, for example, Surinam.

Of interest is the comparison between the demographic situation in Latin America and the situation in other regions of the world, including the developing countries of Asia and Africa. The "Dictionary" makes it possible to pick out easily the specific features of a region's demographic development and to better evaluate the degree of effectiveness of the demographic and

socio-economic policy measures which are being carried out there. The article on the population of socialist Cuba (pp 213-215), written by Cuban specialists, can serve as a successful example. The reader has an opportunity to satisfy himself that in the last quarter of a century the demographic situation in the country has changed in a fundamental way: the mortality rate has fallen sharply, the educational level has increased, the health care system has improved, etc.

It would seem that the "Dictionary" will be useful for specialists as well as for a broad circle of readers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

8543

CSO: 1807/207

## LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

### SOVIET-BOLIVIAN SEMINAR ON BOLIVIA'S SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT HELD

Moscow LATINSKAYA AMERIKA in Russian No 2, Feb 87 pp 141-143

[Article by "Z.I." and "N.K.": "Seminar in Bolivia"]

[Text] In 1985 the Institute of Latin America of the USSR Academy of Sciences (ILA) and the Main University of San Andres (UMSA) in La Paz concluded an agreement on scientific cooperation. As a first step in its implementation two Soviet specialists were invited to participate in a seminar organized at the initiative of the UMSA social sciences faculty and devoted to social development trends in Bolivia. The meeting took place from 23-26 June 1986.

The dean of the UMSA social sciences faculty, Tomas Lenz Bustinsa, addressed the seminar participants, noting the importance of the agreement between UMSA and ILA. The president of the university, Guido Capra Jemiz, made welcoming remarks. He emphasized that in a time of profound crisis such as the country is experiencing now, it is the task of the social sciences to study national conditions more intensively and to search for ways out of the crisis situation.

The economic and socio-political problems of Brazil's development within the context of the processes taking place in the region were discussed at a session of two sections of the seminar. N.V. Kalashnikov, candidate of economic sciences and ILA academic secretary, presented a report entitled "Soviet Latin American specialists on the Main Trends of Latin America's Economic Development." After noting that the crisis of the 80's had become a kind of dividing line in the continent's socio-economic development, the speaker described the features of the development of capitalism in various groups of states, emphasizing the ambiguity of their position. In terms of the nature and the level of development reached in their production relations they belong to the capitalist world; however, as an object of imperialist exploitation by international financial capital they are linked with the developing Afro-Asian states.

In recent decades the accelerated development of capitalist relations in Latin America has been accompanied by the region's increasing involvement in the world capitalist economy. With the model of dependent capitalist development preserved, the consequences of the 80's crisis proved to be more difficult for

this region than for other capitalist states as a result of the single-minded policy of the imperialist centers. In conclusion, N.V. Kalashnikov dwelt on certain prospects for the economic development of the Latin American states in the post-crisis period.

In a report entitled "Current Trends in the Bolivian Economy," Rolando Morales Anaia, a representative of the Center for Economic and Social Research, examined the features of the country's economic development in recent decades. After tracing the implementation of the concept of "revolutionary nationalism," which was applied from 1952 to the early 80's, R. Morales evaluated the internal and external reasons for the current crisis and analyzed the attempts made to relieve it. He dwelt in particular detail on the "new economic policy" being carried out by the government of V. Paz Estenssoro since August 1985.

A report by Professor Danilo Paz Baliviana, head of the UMSA sociology department, was devoted to "A Model of Accumulation and Agriculture." He noted that the "new economic policy" represented the application to Bolivia of M. Friedman's neoliberal ideas. It was aimed at undermining the positions of national industry and subordinating Bolivian agriculture to the interests of foreign capital. In the speaker's opinion, overcoming the current crisis requires a change in the existing model of accumulation so that it will be aimed at protecting local industry and peasant agricultural production.

In concluding the work of the economic section, Vladimir Sanchez, director of the Sergio Almaraz Center for Economic and Political Research, presented a report on "Foreign Debt and Development," which emphasized that the growth of Bolivia's foreign debt in 1971-1984 resulted from the dependence of the country's economy on the developed capitalist states. The government's activities aimed at satisfying IMF repayment requirements only worsens an already bad economic situation. The presence of a developed "informal" sector of the economy, related to the underground trade in raw materials for narcotics, primarily coca, saves Bolivia from failure. During the 1980-1985 period alone, more than \$1.5 billion entered Bolivia as a result of the sale of this raw material, at a time when the total of foreign loans during these same years amounted to \$970 million.

At the second section of the seminar Z.V. Ivanovskiy (ILA), candidate of historical sciences, presented a report entitled "The Evolution of the Socio-Class Structure of Bolivia." After criticizing the non-Marxist concepts of social stratification and setting out the methodological principles which are used by Soviet specialists in studying the problems of socio-political development, the speaker analyzed the main trends in the development of Bolivia's class structure since the 1952 revolution; he focused attention on its heterogeneity, on the sharp increase in the processes of class differentiation, and on the intensification of social contradictions.

Mirea Montpellier, UMSA sociology professor, in a report on "The Make-up of the Bolivian Oligarchy as Part of the Bourgeoisie" examined the situation among the elite of the ruling class, which has economic power at its disposal and is striving to establish reactionary forms of rule to preserve its

predominance. In this researcher's opinion, the financial oligarchy is a single social stratum which has arisen as a result of the merger of industrial and bank capital.

Julio Mantilla Cuellar, sociology professor and UMSA general secretary, presented a report entitled "Cycles of Development in the Bolivian State Since 1952." He dwelt on features of the formation and evolution of the political system and models of the country's economic development. He devoted particular attention to the present stage--since the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (MNR) party came to power. As a result of the implementation of the "new economic policy," which is founded on the postulates of the "Chicago school," employment has fallen, social inequality has increased, the role of the state sector has been weakened significantly, and the positions of the local oligarchy have been strengthened. Under these conditions, the speaker emphasized, the popular masses face the task of overcoming populist illusions and reviving the national unity bloc, while taking into account the mistakes of the past and working out a strategy to struggle against dependence and backwardness.

In a report on "The Political Parties of Bolivia at the Current Democratic Stage," Marcos Domich, UMSA professor of sociology and medicine, examined certain aspects of the activities of the country's political parties. He noted that the ruling circles are attempting to create a new model of political rule, at the heart of which would lie a two-party bourgeois-democratic system for the state. M. Domich showed convincingly that the basic contradiction of Bolivian society is the contradiction between a narrow stratum of the oligarchy, linked to imperialism, and the overwhelming majority of the population, which is interested in the implementation of revolutionary transformations of a democratic, popular, anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchical nature.

The report by Raul Barrios Moron, a sociology instructor and research associate of the Latin American School of Social Sciences (FLASCO), entitled "The Armed Forces and the State" was devoted to the role of the army in the life of Bolivian society. In the speaker's opinion, the great importance of the armed forces in the country's domestic policy arises from the weakness of the institutions of civilian society. The army, which finds support in the doctrine of "national security," is ideologically linked to imperialism; its activities are antinational and antipopular in nature. One manifestation of this is the army elite's approval of implementation of the neoliberal "new economic policy." In R. Barrios's opinion, the progressive currents in the armed forces are in a weak position at the present time; as the the popular movement in the army declines the corporativistic tendencies grow stronger.

In the course of the discussion the following topics were brought up: new trends in the international division of labor, the features of the current structural crisis in the developing countries, currency-financial problems, the nature of the worsening inter-imperialist conflicts in Latin America, etc.



The work of the seminar provides evidence that the expansion of scientific ties between Soviet Latin American specialists and scholars from the region's countries contributes to a deeper concrete-historical and theoretical interpretation of the acute problems now facing the Latin American peoples.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Latinskaya Amerika", 1987

8543

CSO: 1807/207

CHINA/FAR EAST/PACIFIC

PRC WEEKLY CITED ON FOREIGN TRADE SUCCESSES, 'CONSUMERISM'

PM021135 [Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 March 1987 First Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "State Policy: Beijing Review Article" a 900-word "Own Information" report introduced by the following note.

"The Beijing weekly BEIJING REVIEW carries in one of its latest issues an article describing the results, problems, and prospects of the PRC's foreign economic ties."

According to PRAVDA, the article outlines China's successes in foreign economic relations. Saying that "Hong Kong, Japan, and the United States remained the PRC's main trading partners in 1986." PRAVDA says that "the journal points out the growth of the volume of the PRC's trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union and East European countries last year."

Following a review of the successful operations of China's special economic zones, PRAVDA says that BEIJING REVIEW also touched upon "some problems," and goes on.

"BEIJING REVIEW explains that there can be no underestimation of the infiltration of bourgeois ideology and morals and the spirit of consumerism and worship of the golden calf in the country. These negative phenomena are particularly noticeable among some young people." According to PRAVDA, the article also lists the PRC's backward infrastructure, the incompetence of the management apparatus, extortions, bureaucracy, and red tape" as some of the other problems.

/12232

CSO: 1807/288

RENEWED PLO UNITY PRAISED, EGYPT, U.S. NEGATIVE REACTIONS HIT

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Apr 87 p 5

[Unattributed article: "The Decision of the Egyptian Authorities"]

[Text] Egypt has decided to close all representation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) on its territory. The Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs A.E. Abdel Maguid announced this step because of the "hostile position" supposedly adopted by the Palestinians in their relations with Egypt at the session of the Palestine National Council (PNC) held in Algiers.

In the political resolution of the session, the contribution of the Egyptian people in supporting the just struggle of the Palestinian people was noted. However, along with this it emphasized the need to reject the separate Camp David agreements as a condition of the normal development of Palestinian-Egyptian relations--in accordance with the decisions of the inter-Arab summit meetings and previous decisions of the Palestine parliament in exile.

One of the first to react to these events was Israel, whose leaders expressed their satisfaction with the complication of relations between the PLO and Cairo. "We warned our Egyptian neighbors a thousand times that Egypt's interests and those of the PLO contradicted one another", stated Israeli prime minister Yitzaq Shamir.

Progressive forces of the Arab world hailed the Algiers session of the PNC as an important step in achieving unity in the ranks of the Palestinian resistance movement on an anti-imperialist basis. In Algiers the 1985 Amman agreement between the PLO and Jordan, which was one of the reasons for the split, was annulled. Rejecting separate deals, the PLO confirmed its adherence to holding, under the aegis of the UN, an international peace conference on the Middle East as a real step in stopping the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Unity of the basic Palestinian organizations, including Al-Fatah, the Democratic Front and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Palestinian Communist Party and others was achieved on this progressive platform. The Algiers session confirmed that the Palestinian problem, and that means the whole Middle East conflict, cannot be resolved without full participation of the PLO.

It is not surprising that the results of the session were met with hostility in Washington and Tel Aviv. An aide to U.S. Secretary of State R. Murphy stated that the unity achieved in Algiers "undermines the

chances for achieving progress in the negotiations on establishing peace." The Israeli leaders expressed sharp criticism toward the decisions of the Algiers session and one of the ministers announced that "Israel and Jordan will have to look for other Palestinians (outside the bounds of the PLO) for participation in negotiations."

The position of Tel Aviv and Washington is clear. They do not want to attain a genuine settlement of the conflict, taking into account the legal interests of all sides, but rather separate deals of Israel with various Arab countries at the expense of the Palestinians, and the reestablishment of PLO unity does not suit them. In this connection the attempts of the U.S. and Israel to once again play on inter-Arab contradictions are understandable, in order to bring to naught the successes of the Algiers session.

CSO: 1807/293

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

LEBANESE INTERNAL CONFLICT DISCUSSED, SYRIAN ROLE PRAISED

PM151407 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Apr 87 First Edition p 5

[L. Volnov article: "Who opposes the Cease-fire Agreement in Beirut"]

[Excerpts] Lebanon's enemies try to ascribe the civil war there to contradictions among religious communities and to conceal its chief cause, which is the continuing interference in that small Arab country's internal affairs by Israel and its U.S. patrons. Tel Aviv and Washington failed in 1982 in imposing fettering agreements like the "Camp David deal" on Lebanon. Imperialist circles changed tactics on coming up against the resistance movement. A gamble was made on intensifying the insidious playing on the country's internal Lebanese problems. For Lebanon is a state created on a religious basis. It encompasses 18 religious communities--Muslim and Christian--and these are just the major ones. The Muslims include Shi'ites, Sunnis, Druze.... The Christians include Maronites, various branches of Catholics, Orthodox.... The certain contradictions among them are compounded by the Palestinian problem. I am talking about the camps for Palestinian refugees whom Tel Aviv has deprived of their motherland and who have found shelter in Lebanon.

For decades Israel has been fanning national-religious friction in Lebanon. Its agents provoke clashes among various groupings of Muslims and Christians and sow seeds of enmity toward the Palestinians who, like the Lebanese, are victims of the Israeli aggressor. At the same time, diversionary actions are being taken to complicate and weaken Lebanon's ties with the Arab world, particularly with neighboring fraternal Syria. Its military contingent from the pan-Arab peacekeeping force is in the country at the invitation of the Lebanese Government.

The tangle of internal contradictions is, as we see, very complex. The situation in the camp of the right-wing Christians of the "Lebanese Front" has recently been exacerbated. Some have advocated a closer alliance with Syrian, while others have favored a break with it. There have been clashes and attempted coups, and the composition of the leadership of the leading right-wing Al-kata'ib Phalangist Party has changed.

At the same time the Muslim communities, which had long felt themselves to be in a submissive position, began playing an increasing role. The national patriotic forces (the Progressive Socialist Party, the Communist Party, and

other parties) managed to establish close contact with Muslim circles representing a large part of the population. Although not within the framework of a unified movement, they advocated an alliance with the Shi'ite "Amal" organization ("Lebanese Resistance Regiments"). One of its groupings is considered pro-Iranian.

But last year changes occurred in the "Amal" movement's position. Its leadership decided to subject to its unified control all regions where a Shi'ite population lives. That led to the so-called "camps war" and exacerbated the situation. The situation was also affected by disagreements within the Palestinian movement itself, which is now making efforts to strengthen its unity.

All this led to the result that in February the clashes in Beirut were no longer affecting the Palestinian camps along. The communist party headquarters also came under "Amal's" blows. There were attacks on the Progressive Socialist Party's organizations. Describing the situation in the capital, W. Junblatt, the party's leader, said that "what happened is the result of a great political breach arising between the 'Amal' movement and the patriotic forces." He advocated reorganizing the national patriotic forces." He advocated reorganizing the national patriotic forces' relations with the "Amal" movement and "reinforcing these relations by an alliance with Syria."

In February alone 120 people were killed and 1,100 wounded in the capital as a result of clashes. The Lebanese Government asked Syria to introduce troops into the capital. That step met with the approval of the residents of Beirut and the leaders of political parties and organizations.

The coming into effect of a cease-fire agreement on Monday was a reassuring aspect. It was reached in Damascus between delegations of the Shi'ite "Amal" movement and the Palestine National Salvation Front with Syrian mediation. The parties to the agreement stated their desire to end the "camps war" and to mobilize all forces for the struggle against the Zionist enemy and for the strengthening of Lebanese-Palestinian relations.

Addressing a rally in Beirut recently, George Hawi, general secretary of the Lebanese Communist Party Central Committee, emphasized that the lack of concerted actions among the patriotic forces has led to internecine conflicts, the most dangerous of which was the fighting between Palestinians and the "Amal" movement. He pointed out that since Syrian troops were introduced into West Beirut, favorable conditions have taken shape for rallying all patriotic forces into a united front.

So, relative calm reigns in Beirut, although individual provocative acts are occurring both in the capital and around the Palestinians' camps. In an attempt to frustrate the normalization process the Israeli occupiers and their puppets are committing acts of aggression and exacerbating the situation in the south of the country. All this demands vigilance and fortitude of the Lebanese patriots.

/12232

CSO: 1807/289

## MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

### BA'TH PARTY HISTORY, SYRIAN ROLE IN LEBANON ANALYZED

PM071337 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 87 First Edition p 7

[Special correspondent P. Demchenko article: "Syria: Problems of the Day"]

[Text] Damascus-Moscow--In Syria you most frequently encounter a brief slogan consisting of just three words--"Unity, Freedom, Socialism." This is the motto of the country's ruling Arab Socialist Renaissance Party, which is customarily called Ba'th (renaissance) throughout the Arab world. These days the party is celebrating its 40th anniversary. This provides an opportunity to speak about it in more detail, particularly as it has traveled a very complex path.

In fact the Ba'th movement emerged in Syrian petit bourgeois circles as long ago as during World War II. In April 1947 several small groups motivated by the desire for the independence and unification of all Arab peoples created their own party. Its basic motto, as we have seen, begins with the word "unity."

This is no accident: It was conceived as a pan-Arab party. Its branches came into being at that time in Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, and South Yemen. The Ba'th leaders at that time adhered to a rather simplistic theory, if judged from today's positions, according to which the party's accession to power in a particular Arab country would automatically lead to their merging in a unified state formation. However, the very first attempts to apply the theoretical and ideological principles in practice showed their impracticality. This was manifested particularly clearly after the Ba'th Party acceded to power almost simultaneously in Baghdad and Damascus in the spring of 1963. It seemed to have obtained an opportunity to verify the ideas of Arab unity in practice, but the experiment failed. What is more, relations between the two countries were disrupted, and they passed from the phase of cooperation into rivalry. It came to light that the contradictions among the different groups and wings united by a single signboard, as well as the influence of local conditions and the social environment on them, were greater than previously supposed.

Precisely for this reason our discussion of the party will be confined chiefly to internal Syrian affairs, where it has accumulated rich and in many respects interesting experience. I will say, for example that the Ba'th party's accession to power put an end to political instability in the country, where there had been more than 10 military coups between 1946, when the French colonialists left, and March 1963. Although the country's leadership was subsequently changed sometimes quite dramatically (in 1966, for example), so that tanks appeared in the

streets and much seemed to be hanging by a thread, the Ba'th Party invariably retained levers for influencing the economy and social life. The party's stay in power over a quarter-century is an unprecedented phenomenon for the Arab world.

At the same time events have shown that genuine political stability and the dynamism of internal development under Syrian conditions can be ensured only on the basis of cooperation among all the country's progressive forces. Particularly as, despite the Ba'th Party's dominant role, Syria has preserved its traditional pluralism: A number of other parties continue to operate in the country, albeit within a definite framework. This led in 1972 to the creation of the Progressive National Front consisting of five parties and organizations, whose chairman is Hafiz al-Asad, president of the republic.

Communists have two representatives on the front's leadership. Incidentally, they joined the government 6 years earlier, and as a result of the 1986 elections they received 9 seats in the 195-seat parliament--the People's Council. (Unfortunately, disagreements over a number of theoretical and tactical questions have arisen among the communists recently and led to a split--I would like to think a temporary a temporary one!) It is precisely cooperation between the Ba'th Party and the communists that determines the chief sociopolitical thrust and effectiveness of the front's activity, Syria's stable anti-imperialism, and the desire to develop ties with socialist countries, primarily the USSR.

It is not hard to understand the importance of cooperation among different political forces, which broadens the regime's social base, in the contemporary situation where Syria finds itself the object of strong external pressure. Particularly dramatic events have been played out since the end of last year, when the British authorities accused Damascus of patronizing international terrorism. Britain broke off diplomatic relations with it and imposed economic sanctions. It was followed by the United States and a number of other West European countries. That led to a reduction in the monetary credits granted to Syria by the West and to an end to deliveries of a number of commodities, including food--which naturally exacerbated the difficulties in supplying the population. In fact, precisely this was the design--to increase dissatisfaction with the regime in the country and to make it more complaisant in relations with the West. Reports of Israeli war preparations appeared simultaneously.

A tense situation had been created, and storm clouds had gathered over the country for the umpteenth time, but the Syrians stood firm, even though it was difficult for them. Rejecting the accusations of any complicity in preparing an explosion at London's Heathrow Airport, President H. al-Asad made a very successful counter move: He proposed convening an international conference on problems of terrorism--which, according to Syrian Information Minister Y. Rajjuh, somehow at once cooled the anti-Syrian campaign. Fearing failure, Western diplomacy endeavored to evade the Syrian proposal, but it was not impossible to continue attacks on Syria with the former bitterness.

New complications for the Syrians arose in February: The situation in neighboring Lebanon had been sharply exacerbated. All Damascus' efforts for national reconciliation among the Lebanese and to restore the country's unity seemed to have come to nothing. Syria even had to introduce its units into western districts of Beirut.



"We were forced to adopt that decision after clashes flared up between detachments of the Shi'ite 'Amal' movement and Lebanese communists," 'A. al-Ahmar, deputy general secretary of the Ba'th Party, told me. "Detachments of the Progressive Socialist Party and other formations had gradually been drawn into the fighting. We communicated with their leaders and realized that, having begun the war, it was hard for them to get out of it. Things were taking a turn for the worse. Our troops entered Beirut and instilled order, and the population welcomed them after a week of hell...."

Indeed, a very delicate situation had taken shape: Moving against each other were those very forces with whose help the Syrians were endeavoring to bring Lebanon back to peace, to tame right-wing and left-wing extremists, and to secure the Israeli goons' full withdrawal from southern Lebanon--which would also make it possible for the Syrian units to leave Lebanon. Of course, Damascus could not allow those forces to be weakened, for that would objectively strengthen supporters of splitting the country and preserving the internecine strife and confusion there, which [would] also have an adverse effect on the situation in Syria itself. Now that the situation has more or less settled down, new efforts are being made to rally the Lebanese patriotic forces and to draw up a realistic platform for resuming the national dialogue.

Thus, Syria is once again fulfilling the role of a stabilizing factor in the Near East by helping neighboring Lebanon to finally find peace after many years of Israeli raids and internal strife and ruin.

/12232

CSO: 1807/283

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

PRAVDA VIEWS CURRENT SUDANESE POLITICAL SCENE

PM211525 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Belyakov dispatch: "Echo of April"]

[Excerpts] Khartoum, April--If you drive out of downtown Khartoum across the bridge at the confluence of the White Nile and the Blue Nile, you will come straight to the new building of the Sudanese Parliament. Low, like most buildings in the city, its fine proportions and simple finish please the eye. I asked one of the soldiers guarding the building to tell me when it was constructed. "I will go and look," the soldier answered and disappeared behind the porch. "Come here," I heard a minute later. I went over. Lying on the ground under a staircase was a broken marble tablet with this inscription: "Parliament Building Opened by President Ja'far Numayri 26 December 1978."

The Numayri regime was overthrown 6 April 1985 as the result of a military coup at the height of a general strike which was threatening to escalate into a popular uprising. For a year after that the country was governed by a transitional military council and a transitional government. The chief task at that period was to prepare for the holding of democratic elections. These were held last April, and a coalition civilian government headed by Al-sadiq al-Mahdi was formed in May.

After the overthrow of the dictatorship a decree on autonomy for the south was adopted and subsequently incorporated in the country's temporary constitution. However, the dominant parties in the present government--the Al-'umma Party and the Democratic Unionist Party, which are underpinned by the Islamic "Al-ansar" and "Al-khitmiyah" sects--are in no hurry to meet the southerners' wishes.

W. Koni Juwak is a prominent politician and leader of the Sudan African Congress Party. Until the beginning of March he held the post of minister of labor but then resigned over disagreements with the premier. We arranged to meet with Koni Juwak at the party's headquarters. But at the last moment he asked me to drive to the journalists club. He gave a press conference there.

"Islamic laws are unsuitable for this multinational country," the former minister argued heatedly. "Religion is a question for each of us, and the country is a matter for all. The premier says that the September laws were not 'truly Islamic' and must be amended. But however you amend these laws, they will still be suitable for only part of the country's population."

I asked the minister of information and culture [title as published] about the situation with the September laws.

"They have been frozen and are being reviewed," Muhammad Tawfiq Ahmad [name as published] replied. "And a law review is a complex matter that takes time."

Muhammad Ibrahim Nuqud, general secretary of the Sudanese Communist Party Central Committee, has a different viewpoint on these problems.

"There is a very easy way to do away with the September laws," he remarked. "We must simply return to the legislation that existed before they were introduced."

The continuing civil war in the south is hitting the country's budget hard--according to various data, the government is spending between 1 and 2 million Sudanese pounds on it every day. Quite frankly, this is an inadmissible luxury under conditions of an economic crisis. But something else is far more important. The country's chief natural resources are concentrated in the south: oil and extensive fertile lands which can easily be opened up. It is impossible to make them serve the Sudanese people as long as hostilities continue.

"Unfortunately, the bourgeois parties which head the government have done practically nothing during the year to establish peace in the south," M.I. Nuqud said. "Our chief asset within the country today is democracy (there are now 47 political parties operating in Sudan). But for democracy, we would not be meeting with you here today," the Sudanese communists' leader smiled.

He received me in his office in the parliament building, where the Constituent Assembly now sits. Nuqud heads the democratic faction there. The struggle between the supporters of democracy and of dictatorship is far from over. The forces which supported the Numayri regime are numerous and influential and are not abandoning hope of returning the country to the times of the dictatorship.

On leaving the parliament building I went down the same staircase beneath which I has seen the broken memorial tablet the previous day. Although taken down, for some reason it has not been thrown onto the garbage heap. Evidently some people would still like to stick that tablet together and reerect it in its old place. But the Sudanese people reject such a prospect. Having thrown off the fetters of dictatorship 2 years ago, today they are struggling to ensure that there is no return to it.

/12232

CSO: 1807/284

MIDDLE EAST/NORTH AFRICA/SOUTH ASIA

FORMER USSR AMBASSADOR RECALLS TRIPOLI BOMBING

PM141125 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Apr 87 First Edition p 3

[Article by Oleg Peresypkin: "In Those Hard Days... Former Soviet Ambassador Describes the Barbaric U.S. Attack on Libya"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] Tripoli-Moscow--A year ago, on the night of 14 April, U.S. aircraft which had taken off from U.S. military bases in Britain and from three aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean--the "Saratoga," the "Coral Sea," and the "America"--delivered a missile and bomb strike against military and civil targets in Tripoli and Benghazi. These targets included the headquarters of M. al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, several air defense establishments, and airfields in Tripoli and Benghazi. The main pretext for the attack was to punish the Libyan leadership, which was allegedly encouraging terrorist organizations and in particular bore responsibility for an explosion at a West Berlin discotheque where one U.S. soldier died and several soldiers were wounded. These events are described by Oleg Gerasimovich Peresypkin, a diplomat and orientalist and rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy, who was Soviet ambassador to Libya at the time.

The evidence of the Libyans' involvement in acts of terrorism in Europe proved to be highly unconvincing. Subsequently the U.S. press itself published reports that this evidence had been organized by the CIA. Langley deliberately created an image of an enemy who had to be punished. It is well-known that any action can be ascribed to anyone you like by planting a few documents, objects, and reports to use against the necessary people, organizations, or state. Especially when a pretext is required to "teach a lesson" to a refractory leader or inconvenient country pursuing a policy running counter to the approach of the U.S. military-industrial complex, whose interests for some reason extend to the Mediterranean, thousands of kilometers from the U.S. national borders. One cannot fail to recognize U.S. responsibility for the development of the world situation. But it should logically come down to seeking ways of reducing tension and resolving conflict situations, not pretexts for conflicts, arrogating the right to lynch law, the right to punish other states and to portray this as supreme virtue and heroism. What amounts to fist-law never generated additional respect to anyone, least of all a state which lays claim to the special position of a great power in our troubled world.

I am waiting in the club of the USSR Embassy in Libya for a meeting with embassy staffers who lived through the bandit attack by U.S. aircraft outside the city and in other parts of the country. The new evidence of the courage of Soviet people at the sharp end of international politics is of extreme interest to me.

The club is called the Muntasir club for its former owner. A small three-story private house with an intricate mosaic floor. Three palm trees, a volleyball court with a net across it, and a large hangar-like building with a stage and a cinema screen and a socialist competition leaders stand. Behind the club well is a children's area and a two-story building housing the library and medical center. An ordinary club for an ordinary Soviet institution. Or not quite. This is nonetheless a foreign country and you can feel it in the small details which you involuntarily notice if you look closely. An automobile has arrived from Misratan city to collect feature movies for Soviet specialists working there. I hear complaints that the Moscow organizations are not treating Tripoli to new movies although who if not our people working away from the motherland should have priority when sending these movies. Here is a book kiosk. They have brought new Soviet books. A Libyan comes in, dressed in a long shirt reaching almost to his knees. He is looking for the building of the Libyan Red Crescent Committee, which is 200 meters away, in the next street.

A game is ending on a volleyball court--several women appear in the room. Women and children make up half the Soviet colony in Libya. What was it like for them here under the U.S. bombs and rocket fire?

"Everything happened suddenly, at night. We did not even have time to be frightened," a diminutive young woman in a tracksuit says. "I was standing at the window of my room when the blast wave caused the frames to open. If the catch had been strong the glass would have shattered. After all it was only 500-700 meters in a direct line from the place where the bomb fell."

I have already visited the place where the U.S. bomb fell. Houses were destroyed and several dozen people died, including children. The blast wave sliced away the away the walls of the houses and I saw a bathroom with children's underwear hanging in it and a doll which had remained miraculously intact behind the armature of the destroyed concrete girder. All the windows and doors at the French Embassy were blown in and the building is beyond repair. Damage was caused to the building of the GDR ambassador's residence and the Swiss and Romanian Embassy buildings.

"The lamps in our club were smashed," the young woman continues. She is called Galya and she has been working at a Soviet institution in Tripoli for a year now and is considered an old hand. "The glass was blown in in the apartments of several staffers. But we were frightened later, when we learned it was an attack by U.S. aircraft. Each day we waited for them to come flying in again and start bombing. Then somehow we grew used to it. Only we were sorry for the children: Many of them became nervous and began to be afraid of the roar of aircraft and even automobiles."

I was told that fragments from U.S. bombs and missiles were collected around the Muntasir club and in adjacent streets. I was pieces of rusty, flaky metal

blackened by soot from the explosive. Many of these fragments collected on neighboring streets near foreign embassies have become unique souvenirs. True, it would be better if they did not exist, these sinister souvenirs, each one of which could instantly have taken a human life. Galina confirms that yes, she too has such a fragment and she does not intend to part with it. In our time of peace the 25-year-old woman has learned what a bomb attack is and even has, to remind her of it, a piece of metal smelted somewhere there, across the ocean.

The U.S. aircraft's attack on Tripoli and Benghazi rocked the whole world. Europeans came out onto the streets of their cities, the Arab world was in turmoil, and demonstrations took place in other countries. The U.S. military's flagrant attack was assessed as a manifestation of the policy of U.S. state terrorism against independent states. This policy is also manifested in the acts of provocation against Afghanistan and in support of the Nicaraguan contras. In the USSR and the other socialist countries the attack met with an identically negative and sharp assessment.

A feeling of involvement and sympathy with other people's misfortune and trouble, however, far away this misfortune may have occurred, has always been characteristic of the Soviet people. That is why demonstrations were held in Moscow in front of the U.S. Embassy and Soviet scientists and young people presented U.S. diplomats with their protest petitions. But this involvement could be felt especially in the personal letters from ordinary Soviet people to the Libyan people and their leaders. Here the majority of the letters were sent by mature people, veterans of the front who know the words "attack" and "bomb raid" not from books but from their own lives.

I saw these letters at the USSR Embassy in Tripoli. I particularly remember the letter from Ivan Ivanovich Avdokiyeenko from Novgorod to Mu'ammarr al-Qadhafi. Avdokiyeenko signed it as follows: "A citizen of the USSR, a simple man from ancient Novgorod who has taken to heart the misfortune of a foreign people."

...The club gradually filled with people. Here were staffers from the embassy and other Soviet institutions in Tripoli and from the all-union "Aviaeksport" association, and other specialists. The film began. But a group of embassy staffers set off to the airport to meet with a Soviet delegation. The delegation had come to take part in the Soviet-Libyan friendship week. The "Voronezh Girls" ensemble was with the delegation. Would people in Libya understand our slow songs, our stately Russian dances? After all, they are a different people with a different culture. And perhaps it is a good thing that we are different. Each people contributes to the treasury of world culture something that is its own, that is special, and unlike the rest.

...Back in Moscow, I had a telephone call at home from Galina, who had arrived on leave. She said that the Voronezh Girl's concerts had been very successful.

/12232

CSO: 1807/289

END